

The Council re-assembled at the Council Chamber, Fort St. George, at 11 a.m. on Saturday the 18th day of March 1922, the hon. Diwan Bahadur Sir P. RAJAGOPALA ACHARIYAR Avargal, K.C.S.I., C.I.E., President, presiding.

I

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

[*Order made by the President of the Madras Legislative Council under Standing Order No. 15—*

(1) Printed copies of the questions and answers to be put and given at a meeting of the Council shall be placed on the Council table an hour before the President takes his seat.

(2) The questions shall be put and answered in the following manner:—

The Secretary shall call the name of each interpellator in alphabetical order, specify the serial numbers of his questions and make a sufficient pause to allow him or any other member a reasonable opportunity of rising in his place if he is desirous of asking a supplementary question. Supplementary questions must be put immediately after the principal questions to which they relate.]

The duties of the Collector of Madras.

1376 Q.—Diwan Bahadur C. ARUNACHALA MUDALIYAR: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state what the duties were of the Collector of Madras, prior to 1900, 1910, 1920, and in 1922?

A.—The Collector of Madras originally combined with the by no means inconsiderable duties of an ordinary Collector, in so far as they arise within the capital city, the following appointments:—
(1) Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board, (2) Collector of Sea Customs, (3) Protector of Emigrants, (4) Superintendent of Stamps and (5) Superintendent of Stationery. He was relieved of the duties of Chairman of the Harbour Trust Board prior to 1900. Between 1900 and 1910 he was relieved of the duties of Collector of Sea Customs and his staff of assistants was more than proportionately decreased. Between 1910 and 1920 he was given the additional duties of a Paymaster of Carnatic Stipends. Meanwhile his work in connexion with the income-tax has very largely increased, the collections in 1920-21 being Rs. 69,99,132 as against collections of Rs. 31,28,673 in 1910-11. In 1922 the same work continues. It is not proposed that he should be relieved of any income-tax work when the bulk of the staff becomes Imperial.

Punitive Police in the disturbed mill area.

1377 Q.—Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(a) what is the total strength of the additional police force (punitive) located in the disturbed mill area with reference to the press communiqué dated the 17th September 1921;

(b) what is the estimated cost of such additional police force;

(c) what is the total resident population of the area comprised within the Perambur police zone; and

(d) whether the Government propose to exempt Government servants or any other loyal section of the public within that area from payment of the contribution towards the cost of the additional police force?

[18th March 1922]

A.—(a) The total strength of the additional police is 2 Inspectors, 2 Sub-Inspectors, 4 Sergeants, 20 head constables and 200 constables.

(b) The approximate total cost of the additional police including the clerical staff is Rs. 71,500 for six months, the period for which the force has been sanctioned.

(c) The Government have no precise information.

(d) The Government have decided not to recover the cost of the force from any of the inhabitants.

Proportion of non-Brahmans in Public Service.

1378 Q.—Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state how the extension of the principle in Board's Standing Order No. 128 (2), accepted by the Government in connexion with the resolution moved by Mr. Tanikachala Chetti at the meeting of the Council held in August last, is proposed to be given effect to amongst the gazetted officers in the different departments of the Secretariat and in the office of the Board of Revenue ?

A.—The question is under consideration.

Persons from the mufassal willing to come to the Secretariat or other offices in the City of Madras.

1379 Q.—Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD SADULLA BADSHA SAHIB Bahadur: Will the hon. the Member for Finance be pleased to state—

(i) whether, with reference to G.O. No. 613, Public, dated 16th September 1921, he proposes to call for information as to the number of
 (1) non-Brahman Hindus,
 (2) Indian Christians, and
 (3) Muhammadans,

in the mufassal offices who are willing and eligible to be employed in the Secretariat or other offices in the Madras City ; and

(ii) if information has already been called for and obtained, whether he will place it on the table ?

A.—The point on which the hon. Member desires information has no immediate connexion with G.O. No. 613, Public, dated 16th September 1921.

The Government are collecting information with regard to non-Brahman Hindus, Indian Christians and Muhammadans suitable for drafting into the Secretariat from mufassal offices, but cannot lay such papers on the table.

First-class special stipendiary magistrates.

1380 Q.—Mr P. SIVA RAO: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state what steps the Government have hitherto taken to introduce the scheme of appointing special stipendiary magistrates of the first class and of divesting the present revenue divisional officers of their magisterial functions ?

A.—The Government have sanctioned as an experimental measure the appointment of one stipendiary first-class magistrate in each of the districts of Coimbatore and Ramnad to try criminal cases exclusively.

18th March 1922]

Police Sub-Inspectors of the Southern Range.

1381 Q.—Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA: Will the hon. the Home Member be pleased to state—

(1) how many officers from the cadre of sub-inspectors of police have been promoted to be circle inspectors since 1st January 1915 in the southern range;

(2) how many of the above are Indian Christians;

(3) what is the total strength of the cadre of sub-inspectors of police in the southern range; and

(4) how many of the above are Indian Christians?

A.—(1) 26.

(2) 1.

(3) 376.

(4) 42.

II

The Council resumed consideration of the budget for 1922-23.

DEMANDS FOR GRANTS.

DEMAND II—EXCISE.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATEL:—“Sir, I beg to move for a grant not exceeding 30·38 lakhs under Demand II—Excise.

Motion 201.

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

201. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 32,160 for two deputy commissioners.*

“Sir, this question of the desirability and the possibility of getting rid of the appointment of deputy commissioners in the Excise department was discussed at great length during the time of the budget discussion last year. The arguments for and against the reduction were both given in extenso on that occasion. It was then urged on behalf of Government that it was neither possible nor desirable to reduce the number of deputy commissioners in the Excise department. There were then four deputy commissioners. Since then, the Government have found it possible to abolish one out of these four posts, and the hon. the Finance Member has specifically referred to this abolition in his speech introducing the budget. So that, though last year it was thought by the Government that it was not possible to reduce any of these posts, the Government have found it possible to reduce the total number of these four by one this year.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“The post that was abolished was not one of territorial commissioners. It was a specialist’s post.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“My argument holds good whether it was the territorial commissioner’s post or any other post.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—“May I further say that the specialist’s post was not of the grade of deputy commissioner but of assistant commissioner? It still exists.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“My point is that it is desirable and possible to reduce all these four posts. The very fact that my hon. Friend has found it possible to reduce one of the posts shows that the position

[Mr. M. Krishnan Nayar]

[18th March 1922]

taken up last year that it was absolutely impossible to interfere with any of these posts was not correct. I will go further and say that it is certainly possible for the Government to proceed still further and abolish all these posts. What I was going to say before I was interrupted by my hon. Friend the Finance Member was that, since last year one of these posts has been abolished, and that there remain now three posts. Out of these three posts, one is non-votable and therefore untouchable. Therefore, there remain only two posts, and what I recommend in this resolution is that both these posts may be abolished. I do not propose, Sir, to go this year at length into the reasons for the abolition of these posts. They were considered already last year. These offices are what I may call intermediary posts serving as a sort of post office between the lower posts and the head of the department.

"My hon. Friend the Finance Member more than once referred in this Council to the attempts made by him in the Finance Committee to effect as much economy as possible without in any way interfering radically with the main policy of the Government. In fact, my recommendation is to effect a change in the policy by getting rid of these intermediary posts. Some of the functions that are now performed by these Deputy Commissioners, it is quite possible to transfer to the Assistant Commissioners, and the other functions to the head of the department. As I said, I do not think it necessary to go at length into this question this year. With these words, I move that the provision of Rs. 32,160 for these two Deputy Commissioners may be taken away."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I am glad to have this opportunity that my hon. Friend has given me in moving his resolution to state what exactly the place which the Deputy Commissioners fill in the scheme of the Excise department. It will be no exaggeration to say that the present efficient state of the Madras Excise department has been built up by young European bachelors and civilians. It is to the incessant watchfulness, the incessant travelling and the exceptional energy and zeal that was shown, the driving power that was necessary in order to keep the whole staff in trim which they have displayed, we owe the present efficiency of the Excise administration and it has been an example to the whole of India. The Excise Committee, in reviewing the systems that are prevailing throughout India, have given high credit to the Madras system.

"But, Sir, this system, though it has worked very satisfactorily and has brought the whole into a very efficient state, latterly it was reorganized and under that re-organization, other elements have been introduced. The Anglo-Indian element was largely introduced. When the system has worked for some time longer the original efficiency lagged. Therefore it fell to the lot of our present hon. the Finance Member, when he was in charge of the department, to re-organize the whole thing, to infuse new life and new energy into the Excise policy in Madras. He found then that it was necessary to introduce energetic Indians into the service in order that by their experience they may qualify themselves to fill the place of Assistant and Deputy Commissioners. As a result, you find to-day many brilliant young men who have thus been encouraged to take up service in the Excise department. At one time, Indians did not have the courage to enter that department; the great physical strain and the arduous nature of the work deterred them from entering that service. But after the encouragement given by the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter, a number of young men have been coming up. I will show you presently how it is necessary that the deputy

18th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

commissioners should be retained because they have to manage a very large number of subordinates. About 834 sub-inspectors have to be managed, their work has to be checked and supervised, the appointments have to be looked into, and the promotions either by selection or seniority have to be attended to. It is therefore necessary that a high and responsible officer should be in close touch with the work of the subordinates. During his tours he has to find out those subordinates who are slack in their duties and who are not up to the mark and deal with them suitably either by transferring them or by infusing new life into them and by other ways.

“Now coming to the deputy commissioners, I will show how these 11-15 a.m. high officers at this present state are necessary. We are now in troublesome times. Hence it was found necessary for a deputy commissioner to go out and give courage and life even to the revenue officials. Recently, while the abkari sales were going on in the mufassal, there was trouble and the police and the revenue officials were not equal to the task.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—“I wish to know whether this is an official statement.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“Yes, it is. As they were not able to cope with the situation, the deputy commissioner had to go out himself with his staff in order to keep the situation in hand.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“Are not revenue officials also similarly indented upon for the work which the salt officers were not able to cope with ?”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“The deputy commissioner had been able to bring about order and had been able to evolve peace in that place. Not only in one place, in several places these high officials by their personal example and energy have been able to restore peace and order.

“I may refer to one deputy commissioner working in the Northern circle. He had been one of the competition wallahs who came into the service. We want people like him in order that there should be driving power given to the subordinates, that there should be more energy in them and that there should be more control over them. We want people like that so that by their example they may infuse new life into the subordinates and keep the Excise department in a high level of morality in comparison with either the Police or the Forest department. You will see that these officers are setting a personal example to their subordinates by their energy. By this I do not cast any reflection either on the Police or the Forest department. I say, in comparison with these departments you will find that the Excise department officers have been able to keep up a high level of official morality and efficiency. This is due entirely to the example set by the deputy commissioners.

“My hon. Friend stated that this work could be done by assistant commissioners —”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“I said ‘partly.’”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“In the ranks of the assistant commissioners we have got persons recruited years back and they are about to retire. After their retirement a better class of persons will be introduced and it will be possible then to consider the whole question. But in these

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[18th March 1922]

troublesome times, you will agree with me that there is necessity for these officers in order that they may infuse life and vigour into these 834 subordinates.

“Let us now see what an assistant commissioner can do. Of the 11 assistant commissioners, 6 are in charge of both Abkari and Salt and their time is taken up with that. There are only three assistant commissioners whose time can be devoted for abkari purposes. If you want this power to be delegated to these assistant commissioners you will have to multiply the number of inspectors as well as the circles. So by abolishing one of the deputy commissioners you will have to increase the number of assistant commissioners or the number of inspectors. The whole question lies between Abkari and Salt, and it is a very complicated one. Unless there is a complete separation between the two it will not be possible to make any definite statement at present. Madras having been held as one of the best administered in the Excise department you will agree with me that we should keep up that reputation and the reputation of the officials managing and controlling the department. I therefore submit that at present it is not at all advisable that we should reduce the strength of the deputy commissioners.

“Some of my friend's from the Ceded districts would agree with me that owing to the considerable amount of illicit distillation that is going on there and owing to the inefficiency of the subordinates in the Ceded districts—members from the Ceded districts have from time to time brought this to my notice—it is necessary that we should form the district into separate divisions and appoint energetic officers so that illicit distillation can be driven altogether out of that district. So, instead of reducing the number the House will agree with me that for the Ceded districts we may perhaps have to appoint another officer to reduce the drink and illicit manufacture and thus gradually arrive at what is most advocated by you and by me, viz., the goal. Therefore, in order that you should have efficient administration it is necessary that we should maintain these high officials. I therefore request my hon. Friend to withdraw his motion.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“The House would have listened with mixed feelings to the speech made by the hon. the Minister in charge of Excise. Personally I am inclined to think that he did not put his heart into what he said. His predecessor who spoke at some length last year during the time of the budget wanted to tell us the duties that the deputy commissioners were doing. I am glad the present Minister has been wise enough to omit saying anything on this aspect, for, if he had attempted to say anything, he would have had very little to say on their behalf in that direction.

“He referred, Sir, to the fact that the efficient administration of the Excise department was due to the energy, youth, and the driving power of deputy commissioners. I would like to know the ages of the deputy commissioners with whom we are primarily concerned. I can state that they are pretty old and they have completed their services, but they are clinging to their offices because the age limit for retirement has not yet been reached.

“Then, Sir, it was said that the revenue officials are not equal to cope with certain situations when they arise. I strongly object to this statement. I think the officials of the revenue department are next to none in their efficiency, and in their conscientious discharge of duties. In any case, if the

18th March 1922] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

implication based on the argument that the revenue officials are not able to cope with certain situations is to be accepted, I can as well say that the police officials are altogether inefficient, because they invoke the aid of the magistrates on certain occasions when they cannot cope with the situation.

“ It was stated that Indians had no courage to enter the service in this department. I think that statement should have been thought over twice before it was made. I contend that no opportunity was till now given to Indians to enter and rise in the service and that they have not as many facilities as the Europeans have to enter and prosper in the service. That is the reason why Indians do not care to enter this department. If the hon. the Minister in charge of Excise would give opportunities to Indians for entering this service, a number of people would be forthcoming.

“ Then, Sir, he referred to the fact that illicit distillation was going on in certain districts. I mentioned last year that this was going on with the knowledge or connivance of the officials of the department concerned. Then the hon. the Finance Member stood up valiantly, as of course he was bound to do owing to his long connexion with the department, and challenged my statement. But the hon. the Minister since admitted in Bellary that these things were going on with the knowledge of the officials. He went very much farther in his speech and said that it was due to the connivance of the officials. The people alone are not to blame for these offences. The officials are as much responsible for them. However, I do not see where the necessity for the deputy commissioners comes in, in this connexion. I think the House should reject the provision for two of them at least.”

Diwan Bahadur M. KRISHNAN NAYAR:—“ I have listened to the statements made by my hon. Friend Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar and also those made by the hon. the Minister in charge of Excise. Having regard to the fact that the Minister in charge of this department dwelt particularly upon the difficulties of the present time, I intend withdrawing the motion, if I am permitted to do so.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 202 to 204.

The following motions were not made :—

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

202. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 32,160 for two deputy commissioners.*

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

203. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 32,160 for two deputy commissioners.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

204. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 32,160 for two deputy commissioners.*

Motion 205.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

205. *To reduce the allotment of two-thirds of Rs. 95,520 being the provincial share of the cost of eleven assistant commissioners by Rs. 17,367 and to reduce the number of assistant commissioners employed in the Excise branch by*

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [18th March 1922]

two, and to move the Government of India to make a corresponding change in the proportion of the cost of the department borne by the Provincial and Imperial Governments, respectively.

“The hon. the Minister in charge of this department went at great length to support the position of higher officers, i.e., for the provision of deputy commissioners. Thereby he never thought that by his speech he would be helping me with reference to my motion to reduce the number of assistant commissioners. He said that most of the present assistant commissioners were useless people practically and that therefore, till they retired, the present deputy commissioners would be required to be in their own places.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—“I did not say assistant commissioners.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“The word ‘assistant commissioners’ was clearly used. I will make it more clear later on. He said the present assistant commissioners were not doing their duties but that there might be better recruitment when these people retired, and then probably the number of deputy commissioners also might be reduced. These words are still ringing in my ears and I am prepared to withdraw the statement if it is now stated wrong. He said, Sir, that the present assistant commissioners were recruited at a time when educated Indians were not prepared to enter the Excise department. Whatever the reason may be, I submit, and it is very clearly admitted, that the present assistant commissioners are not doing their duties as satisfactorily as they may be expected to do. That is the sum total of the speech that has been made by the hon. the Minister.

“So far as my motion is concerned, there are two things that require looking into. The question of the allotment by the Government of India and the present Government is required to be looked into. The proportion was fixed at a time when there was a large number both of excise and salt officers. Now I understand the number of people who are doing salt work has not been reduced, but the number of officers doing the excise work has been reduced. In any case it is desirable when we go into the question of allotment, that we should make a large increase in the contribution by the Government of India.

“There are eleven assistant commissioners doing both salt and abkari work. One of these, I may say, is in charge of Bellary and Kurnool districts. He does not practically do any salt work. If you forget the bifurcation of the Bellary district he does work only in two districts of Bellary and Kurnool and then the question is if his jurisdiction cannot be increased and it may be said that these assistant commissioners are practically doing post office work between the deputy commissioners and inspectors. No doubt these assistant commissioners are touring and examining the work of their subordinates. But considering the fact that many of them are not up to the mark and it is likely that new recruits are expected to do better work, certainly a small reduction of two out of the eleven is not after all very great.

“And after all it is only less than one-fifth of the whole number. I think considering the large army of officers below and the deputy commissioners above, as has already been stated, this number 11 is absolutely unnecessary, and in this I am not forgetful of the fact that there has been some reduction in the number of assistant commissioners

18th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

recently, but I only adopt the argument of my friend Mr. Krishnan Nayar in saying that the number which has been declared to be irreducible has been found to be reducible from the number last year, and certainly the heavens are not going to fall owing to additional reduction. If the hon. the Minister will just satisfy us as regards the policy of reducing the drink evil, we should also anticipate a fall in the revenue, and therefore whatever percentage of the present income our expected expense may be, we must expect a fall in the revenue and therefore we must provide for a fall in the expenditure also. What we want is not that the officers who are now in service should go out at once bag and baggage, but that vacancies should not be filled up when there may be vacancies, and I am sure they may be one or two in the year, or places may be found for them in other posts. Anyhow we are all agreed that reduction is necessary and, so far as this department is concerned, I hope that the small reduction I have suggested may not be considered too high. In any case I hope that the hon. the Minister will be prepared to meet us half-way."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Sir, I may first of all state with reference to my hon. Friend's desire that when there are vacancies, the question of filling up these vacancies will be considered, as the vacancies may arise. But for our present purposes, for purposes of the budget, I must say that any reduction of the kind would not be economical nor would it tend to any appreciable saving. If we reduce the assistant commissioners and revert them to the grade of inspectors, the difference in salary is not very considerable and what the saving would be the House can very well realize when I say that it would be the salary of the last grade sub-inspector or the temporary sub-inspector who may have been taken a few years back into the chain of appointments. In this chain, we would be taking away one of those officers, until we reach the last grade sub-inspector of the temporary kind on a salary of Rs. 30 or Rs. 40. It is he that will have to be sent away. So, as far as saving or economy is concerned for the purposes of the budget, I am afraid we cannot have much at all. If it is the desire of the House that as vacancies occur the question of reducing the cadre should be more thoroughly examined, I am prepared to do so. But at present it would not be possible as I said to reduce the number because it would not at all be a profit so far as the budget is concerned. Of the 11 assistant commissioners we have in the department, six are employed in the Salt branch, four only doing the duty under Excise. Of these four again, three are in charge of divisions, one being, as has been already stated, Bellary, the other two being the West Coast and the North Arcot divisions. As hon. Members know in the case of the Bellary and the West Coast divisions, it is necessary that we should have a high official in order to properly control and check what is going on there. If we take away an assistant commissioner—I know that people from Bellary would say that the present assistant commissioner is old and about to retire—we will replace him by another and more energetic official from the department, and the sort of work that we are carrying on will be carried on more thoroughly. Therefore the three divisions that are now occupied by the assistant commissioners at present require closer attention and greater control than before. I must therefore submit to the House that it is not possible at present to reduce the strength of the assistant commissioners, but, as I said, as vacancies occur we shall examine and see if we can reduce the number then. I also want to submit to the House this further

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[18th March 1922]

fact. Hon. Members would find in the pages of the budget under Excise on the left-hand side that a number of appointments have been reduced this year in the Excise department. The number of deputy commissioners has been already reduced by one, and reductions have been made in the number of other officers. We cannot all at once reduce the appointments as desired, although the revenue may have fallen. If we want that temperance should take root, if we want that illicit distillation, illicit manufacture of liquor and illicit tapping should be checked, we must have a sufficient number of officers to keep a watch in the various taluks and districts, so that illicit distillation and illicit drinking may be effectively prevented. If we reduce the staff, we would be making it all easy for people to take to illicit drinking, etc., as it is now the case in Nellore. In Nellore the people themselves are preaching and raising obstructions against drink habit, but we find as a matter of fact that in Nellore the drink habit is going on everywhere and the farm servants and the other farmers are freely given drink during nights. Therefore if we want to reduce the country to such a state, you can by all means have it. But I may warn hon. Members that if they take away the necessary and efficient preventive staff and thus remove the agency which exercises control over the illicit manufacture of alcohol or toddy, drink will go on unhampered. If we want to control these things, as we must, then it will not be possible for the department to cope with the work of control of drink without this staff. The three divisions, as I said, are now occupied by three assistant commissioners, and it is absolutely necessary that we should have sufficient control in all the three divisions. If things are restored to normal conditions, and if matters improve, then certainly it would be time for us to consider the matter, but at present I beg to assure the House that the retention of all these assistant commissioners is necessary."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"Sir, I beg to support this motion. My ground is not only the supreme necessity that has arisen to cut down every bit of unnecessary expenditure and effect every possible retrenchment, but I base my argument for reducing Excise expenditure and Excise establishment on the plain duty of Government in regard to Excise. The hon. the Finance Member lamented over the loss of Excise revenue and attributed it to the work of the temperance worker whom in his wrath he identified with the revolutionary party."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—"I venture to say, Sir, that the hon. Member is quite wrong in representing me as having identified temperance workers with the revolutionary party."

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—"But the declared policy of Government has been towards introducing prohibition, and the hon. the Minister himself stated that he was in sympathy with all earnest and sincere workers in temperance reform to combat drunkenness, and laid down that the temperance policy of Government has never been influenced by considerations of revenue. What I ask is that, if the Government are sincere in their profession of policy towards drink, their paramount duty is to show that sincerity by effecting a radical reduction in the costly establishments they have to maintain to secure revenue which according to Government ought not to be the material item of consideration. In fact, that, I submit, should be the first and natural step logically the Government is bound to take to show their *bona fides*. As to what Government should do towards introduction and enforcement of prohibition, it is not now my purpose or place to

18th March 1922] [Mr. V. C. Vellingiri Goundar]

say and I will not go into details at present. But I urge once more with all the vehemence I can command that it ought to be possible to begin their temperance work by effecting a reduction or cost of the establishment. I am aware that Government will trot out the well-worn excuse of prevention of illicit manufacture and illicit distillation. This matter is grossly exaggerated and there is not so much illicit manufacture as is stated to exist. Further, it is not by maintaining costly establishments with various sorts of allowances and high-paid officers like deputy commissioners, assistant commissioners and so forth that illicit manufacture is going to be prevented.

"The revenue and police officials from the village munsif to the Collector are already assisting the Abkari department in full measure, and great saving can be effected by reducing the abkari establishment; and revenue officials can be assigned more of abkari work without adding to their burden. It is noticeable that in this year's budget a sum of Rs. 11,440 is allotted as against Rs. 1,440 of last year for horse allowance and it is not known why this increase is called for."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"Sir, I was not able to understand when the hon. the Minister said that the savings by the abolition of one appointment or two appointments would not be considerable, and he explained the point by saying that the savings if any would be only the pay of the last sub-inspector on perhaps Rs. 50 or Rs. 60. I am unable to follow his argument on that matter. He said, for example, there was an assistant commissioner due for retirement in the Ceded districts. Suppose he retires from the beginning of next year and that vacancy is not filled up at all. I should like to know in that case whether the Government does not save the whole of the amount that would be due to him as pay for the year. I can understand if one of the permanent men now is absorbed and perhaps reverted to the grade—."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"Sir, I think my friend is always driving at things outside the motion. I have said already that the proposition is, as the hon. Mover has also said, to cut down expenditure. What I said was that when officers retire we would examine the question, but it was not to cut down immediately. That is the proposition before the House."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"It will be, I think, within the recollection of hon. Members whether the hon. the Minister said that the savings that might possibly be effected by reduction of these numbers for budget purposes would be very small because only the last grade sub-inspector—."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—"It was not that any officer now working was to be turned out."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—"If a person now in office is turned out and made to take the place next below and others below are similarly treated, I can understand that the saving effected will be that of the pay of the last man, but if on the other hand a vacancy is not to be filled up—."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—"I am sorry to rise to a point of order, Sir. That is not the proposition before the House. The proposition is to remove two people from out of the number. It is not when the vacancy comes not to fill it. But what I said was that when a vacancy arose, I would consider the matter."

[18th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ If there is to be a vacancy, then he said he would consider the question. But I ask him in case there are going to be vacancies soon, whether he would not tell the House that he would not fill up those vacancies in case the House indicates a desire to that effect. That is the point I am driving at, and I think that is the point on which the hon. the Minister must be in a position to give us information. The Civil List gives the necessary information and if there are people who are due to retire, he should have mentioned it. He said that so far as the Ceded districts are concerned there was one who was due to retire, and so far as that district is concerned he may make it a point not to fill up that vacancy. ”

“ And then, Sir, there seems to be a misapprehension in the mind of the hon. the Minister that only the Ceded districts require his special attention. Sir, the people of those districts may be somewhat rough, but they are honest folk and they tell exactly what takes place there. I may tell him that there are many districts elsewhere where illicit distillation, illicit tapping and illicit sale of liquor take place and I wish that he would exercise his attention in those places as well and see if he could put an end to such illicit practices. ”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, when some similarly honest people come in from other places also, I am prepared to take the same remedial measures. ”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I think it is a ridiculous position for the Government to take, namely, that Government officers cannot take action unless the guilty people come and give them information. I think it is the duty of the Government to find out such cases and not to merely wait till some person comes and says that there are such and such evils existing. I do not want to say anything more on this point, Sir. ”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ With reference to the question of making the reduction when vacancies arise, may I say one word from the salt aspect of the matter? These officers do both salt and excise duties—. ”

11-45 a.m. The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I do not think it is open to the House to discuss the Salt budget, which is wholly Imperial. ”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ No, Sir, I do not propose to do that. What I wish to point out is this: that the Assembly have passed the Salt budget. If, therefore, two of the assistant commissioners are to be done away with, they must be taken from among the officers engaged exclusively on excise work. The hon. the Minister has shown us that there are only three officers whose duties are confined to excise work and therefore apparently we must try to abolish two out of these three. One of these is on the West Coast and the other two administer groups of districts from Bellary and Vellore, respectively. I do not think it would be possible to abolish the officer on the West Coast, nor can his subdivision be amalgamated with either of the others. The result of the proposal therefore would be this: that we should have to leave the whole of the inland districts without an assistant commissioner. ”

“ In connexion with these districts I feel it is right that I should answer the challenge which was thrown out by Mr. Vellingiri Goundar when he said that the extent of illicit distillation has been grossly exaggerated. ”

18th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar has already answered that to some extent by his account of the state of affairs in the Ceded districts. I should, however, like to add this, that in the past year there were no less than 354 cases of conviction for illicit distillation and of course for each still that is detected there are a great many that go undetected. Meanwhile there has been a 10 per cent reduction in the consumption of licit liquor. Illicit liquor is, of course, very much cheaper than the licit liquor which pays a very heavy duty and I think it is no exaggeration to say that a greater part of this 10 per cent reduction is due to the consumption of the illicit liquor, of which a much larger quantity can be purchased for the same money than of the licit. I therefore ask the House to realize that it is not helping temperance to reduce the excise staff and ignore the increase of illicit consumption at the expense of the licit.

“ To do that would be to bring us to the state in which the Punjab was a few years ago where the authorities had to admit that more than half the liquor consumed in the province was illicit. That is the state of things which we are liable to come to if we allow unchecked the illicit distillation of which we have heard by what are known as the ‘ Home Rule Reddis ’ in the Ceded districts. Unless we take strong action to check this illicit distillation, we shall not only lose our excise revenue, but we shall also be increasing drunkenness by giving place to the consumption of illicit liquor which is much cheaper than licit liquor. Again, it has been suggested that we can leave the detection of illicit distillation to the police officers and the tahsildars. I should like to point out that these officers have their own duties, that it is hopeless to expect them to detect illicit distillation by the policeman on his beat or by the tahsildar as he goes about in his bullock bandy. I should like here like to set Mr. Vellingiri Goundar’s mind at rest by telling him that the horse allowance which he objects to is given to Salt sub-inspectors working in the salt factories and has nothing to do with this question.”

Mr. V. C. VELLINGIRI GOUNDAR :—“ I said, Sir, police officer also.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ The only other matter is the argument that because we have already abolished three posts, we can abolish some more. If you carry this line of argument through to its logical conclusion, the only thing to be done is to abolish the whole department. As to whether the officers who remain in the enlarged jurisdiction resulting from the reductions already made have got enough work to do or not, I should like to invite the attention of the Council to the following figures showing how one of them spent his time. In the course of the year 1921-22 he spent 84 days in the inspection of circle offices, 163 in the inspection of ranges, and 55 on visits to ranges, and had left to him out of the 365 days of the year only 63 days, including Sundays and holidays, for staying at headquarters and attending to the work that has to be done there.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I am glad there was a little humour also on this subject because probably it deals with drunkenness and the Excise Department. I may say one word with regard to what Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar said. When he said that the people of the Ceded districts are honest, I do not suppose that he meant that the people of the other districts are not so.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ May I know if that does follow, Sir ? ”

[18th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ We are not at present concerned with the relative honesty of the people in the several districts. I hope the hon. Member will proceed with the subject under discussion.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I find from the arguments that a reduction has been admitted to be necessary in the case of the Excise department. Instead of a number of slovenly officers if we employ a lesser number of young and energetic men they would be able to do the work more satisfactorily. It need not necessarily follow that a particular reduction should mean the reduction for the whole department itself. My motion does not mean that the two officers should go away at once. It is practically conceded that there will be very soon vacancies in the deputy commissioners and assistant commissioners. If the post of a deputy commissioner becomes vacant an assistant commissioner may be put in his place and so on. If therefore with the assurance of consideration there will be assurance of action, we will be satisfied. There seems to be not a very fair way of dealing with this House. So far as the details of touring are concerned, I do not know how this touring is really useful. If the touring now requires two and a half months before a visit can be repeated to a certain place, another half a month will not be much more serious when the number of officers is reduced. A number of causes for illicit distillation was given ; but a calculation of the number of cases works it at one per district per month. And we know this is mostly due to rival factions, one party complaining against the other that such and such man is having illicit distillation and so on. How this would be prevented by the touring of the assistant commissioner being reduced I fail to see. Kautilya refers to this question too and apart from the question of distillation he says that liquor can be distilled from mango fruits. If a man is inclined to it, he need not go to either coconut or palmyra trees, but he can have it from various other fruits.

“ An assurance has been given that this will receive consideration. Also there is a resolution asking for a total decrease of half a lakh which the House, I am sure, will carry or induce the Government to accept. I therefore do not press this for a division.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 206.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. A. SUBBARAYADU :—

206. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for exchange compensation allowance.*

Motion 207.

Rai Bahadur T. M. MARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I beg to make the following motion :—

207. *To omit Rs. 2,08,500 for 99 assistant inspectors (permanent).*”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I rise to a point of order, Sir ? The majority of these officers are employed in salt factories and as I have already stated the Assembly has passed the whole item of salt. Any resolution that is brought should be similar to that pressed in the case of the Assistant Commissioners. Otherwise we shall be making an alteration in the Assembly budget already passed.”

18th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I understand the hon. the Finance Member to say that most of these officers are employed in salt factories and their pay is debited to the Salt department which is a Government of India department.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ The pay of the whole department is divided in the proportion of two-thirds Excise and one-third Salt. The Salt has been passed by the Assembly. So far as the Excise is concerned, the discussion may perhaps go on, but we cannot attack Salt.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ This is a difficult question. Because there is an arrangement under which the Local Government employ a single establishment for doing work partly Excise and partly Salt, I really cannot prevent the House from discussing the motion before the House.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Sir, the fact is we feel considerable difficulty in this matter of treating certain items as non-votable and preventing us from talking about them.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member was not told that he was not to speak about such items. What the hon. Member was told was that this amount does not wholly concern the Madras Government, but a portion of it is debited to the Government of India. The resolution ought to have been more correctly worded so as to cover only the amount debit able to the Madras Government. It is for the hon. Member to decide if he may withdraw his motion. There are other motions lower down more correctly worded.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 208.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

208. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,08,500 for personal allowance to Assistant Inspectors.*

Motion 209.

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I will just move it as it is. But my only doubt is whether one-third of every item is debited to the Government of India or one-third of the total grant. I think I may be said to have acted on the advice of the hon. the Finance Member in drafting the resolution.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ One-third of the total grant. The whole of the expenses of the department is treated as one. It is very inconvenient to arrange otherwise. For instance, there is a motion which comes later on to reduce the provision relating to contingencies for salt works which if carried would result in Government not being able to carry out the clearance work in salt factories. The position is a very difficult one.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member had better proceed with his motion.”

[18th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I formally move, Sir—

209. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 48,800 for 23 assistant inspectors employed on excise work by Rs. 20,000 and to move the Government of India to make a corresponding change in the proportion of the cost of the department borne by the Provincial and Imperial Governments respectively Rs. 1,00,000.

“ I have given the pay of the 23 assistant inspectors roughly at Rs. 20,000 apart from the salt factory and other work. I do not think these assistant inspectors are necessary. They are more or less assisting inspectors and in some places I hear they are also obstructing the inspectors in their work. They do not even do the work of the post office. They sometimes of course do what they are told to do by the inspectors. I may say, Sir, that I have also spoken to some of the officers of the department on this point. I am strongly of opinion that even if there be some danger in abolishing high offices there is no danger in reducing the number of these assistant inspectors. I do not know what the Minister will have to say. Anyhow I propose the reduction.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I fear I cannot agree with my hon. Friend in the reduction of the number which he pleads for. The position is like this. The assistant inspectors whom he wants to reduce are all not only in charge of preventive work but they are also in charge of distilleries. The fifteen men who are in charge of distilleries were specially trained for this purpose and they are in charge also of the go-down and they handle large quantities of liquor and also money realized from these distilleries. These fifteen men in charge of distilleries are very important officers and as such it would not be possible at all to reduce them.

“ Then, there are others who are assisting the inspectors in charge of very heavy circles. Now, for the purpose of assisting those inspectors, special assistance is given in certain circles, because the work is so heavy and the time of the inspector does not permit him to make very frequent inspections. Well, if the assistant inspector is engaged in the preventive work, the inspector of that circle would be engaged in organizing and in going over the places. Therefore, in heavy circles an assistant is given to the inspector. The other fifteen men, as I submitted, who are specially trained for the purpose are engaged in distillery work. As I said, it is a very responsible work and they are in charge of large quantities of liquor manufactured and the bond-houses and they are also handling large sums of money. It is not possible for these fifteen men who have been specially trained for the purpose to be dispensed with, nor is it possible for the assistance that is given to circle inspectors to be taken away at once, unless, as I told you in connexion with another motion, we are prepared to divide the big circles into two and place one inspector in charge of each of these circles. Now, there is one inspector in charge of a big circle assisted by one assistant inspector. If my hon. Friend’s motion is carried, we will have to divide the circles and put in another inspector in the place of the assistant inspector. That is the position to which it will be reduced if the House will accede to this motion. Consequently, I beg that the motion should not be accepted by the House.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I withdraw it, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

18th March 1922]

Motion 210.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

210. *To reduce the provincial share of the allotment of 34 sub-inspectors employed in the excise work, viz., Rs. 29,540 by two-thirds and to move the Government of India to make a corresponding change in the proportion of the cost of the department borne by the Provincial and Imperial Governments respectively Rs. 30,000.*

Motion 211.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I wish to know whether the same objection holds good with regard to these temporary assistant inspectors.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Yes, Sir. Most of them are employed in salt factories.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ Then I don’t make it.”

The following motion was not therefore made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

211. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,200 for assistant inspectors (temporary).*

Motion 212.

The following motion also was not then made :—

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

212. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 25,200 for assistant inspectors,*

Motion 213.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I wish to know if there is the same objection with reference to this motion also.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Yes, Sir.”

The following motion was not therefore made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

213. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 23,880 for sub-inspectors (temporary).*

Motion 214.

The following motion also was not then made :—

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

214. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,000 for personal allowance to petty officers.*

Motion 215.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“ I move—

215. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 5,400 for teachers in salt factories.*

“ I do not know the purpose for which this provision is made.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ This is entirely a salt question, Sir.”

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“ I thought it was education.”

[18th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ To what head is the pay of these teachers debited ? ”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ All the expenditure is debited to the gross head and is divided in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Is two-thirds of this allotment borne by the Provincial Government ? ”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Yes, Sir.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Then the hon. Member is in order in asking for the omission of that portion. The point raised by the hon. the Finance Member is that two-thirds of this expenditure of Rs. 5,400 for teachers in salt factories is being borne by the Madras Government and one-third by the Government of India. The hon. Member cannot of course touch that one-third, because it is not an expenditure of the Provincial Government. But he can ask for the omission of the two-thirds of Rs. 5,400, which is borne by the Madras Government.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, I am afraid I was not quite correct in saying that two-thirds of this provision is borne by the Provincial Government. The Provincial Government bears two-thirds of the gross provision for Salt and Excise ; while the two-thirds includes items which are spent solely on excise services, the one-third similarly includes items spent solely on salt. This is an item entirely relating to salt. It is one-third of the gross expenditure that the Government of India bears.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ I think the situation is this. The hon. Member wants to omit the sum of Rs. 5,400 for teachers in salt factories. It is shown as a votable item in the budget. If the hon. the Finance Member tells us definitely that the money is really not an item of expenditure of the Madras Government, but by some process with which we are not concerned here—we will accept the word of the hon. the Finance Member for it—it is debited to the Government of India, I will rule out the hon. Member. If, however, the expenditure is being wholly or partially paid by the Government of Madras, then the hon. Member will be entitled to move for the reduction either of the whole or of the part borne by the Madras Government. What we want is a definite statement from the Finance Member.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Sir, the effect of this Council disallowing any provision which is made purely for salt work (if I may give an instance which is coming later on, the provision for a railway siding) would be that that item would be omitted, while the total budget provision would still be divided in the proportion of two-thirds to one-third. The net effect of that would be that the Central administration of the Salt department would be crippled, while the Provincial Government would secure a saving in respect of an item in which they are not really liable for expenditure.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The hon. Member has not given a definite statement, if I may venture to say so. I really do not see how I can withhold from the House any item of expenditure which is borne by the Madras Government.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ May I mention this, Sir ? The motion is for the omission of the whole allotment of Rs. 5,400. If it is passed we would be cutting also the portion that is paid by the Government of India, which we could not do.”

18th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I want a statement from the hon. the Finance Member as to how much of this allotment is being borne by the Government of India so that the hon. Member may move for the omission of the other portion of it borne by the Government of Madras. But, as a matter of fact, the hon. the Finance Member has not been able to tell us that."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I explain, Sir, that what is shared is the gross provision, but this gross provision is made up of items which are purely excise and items which are purely salt and items which are divided. If the House cuts out a purely salt item, it affects the administration of the Central department, but gives the Provincial Government a saving to which it has no title. I quite agree that the arrangement is an unsatisfactory one and we are addressing the Government of India as regards the readjustment of these charges."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"I can deal only with the point of order. I want a statement or an assurance from the hon. the Finance Member that this expenditure does not ultimately fall upon the Madras Government. Till he says that—it may be that in the first instance the Madras Government pays it but recovers it afterwards from the Government of India—whatever it be, till he says that, the point will remain undecided."

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER:—"May I say that the expenditure is divided by the rule of thumb? We have a letter under preparation addressing the Government of India regarding the revision of the rates."

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—"It is a matter for consideration by the House—as we understand that the question is going before the Government of India and will, I hope, be solved in some way which should make it more intelligible to the House, at any rate, before it comes up next year—whether this thing may not be put aside instead of a lot of time being spent over it."

Sriman SASTI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—"I do not want, Sir, that the time of the House should be wasted. I think it is a very important question, because it concerns the salt question. We cannot discuss it if all the expenditure is borne by the Government of India, and if any amount is to be borne by the Madras Government, we are entitled to discuss it. As you were pleased to point out, I do not want to discuss that constitutional point. I shall withdraw the motion for the present."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 216 to 224.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—

216. *To reduce the allotment Rs. 15,37,300 for establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN:—

217. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 27,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

218. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 27,000.*

[18th March 1922]

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

219. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 27,000.*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

220. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 27,000.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

221. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 1,38,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

222. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 27,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

223. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 27,000.*

Mr. K. SARABHA REDDI :—

224. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,87,050 for fixed travelling allowance for sub-inspectors by Rs. 93,525.*

Motion 225.

12-15 p.m. Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I beg to move—

225. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,57,050 for travelling allowance and fixed travelling allowance for sub-inspectors by Rs. 1,00,000.*

“ At page 50 of the Civil Budget Estimate, we find, Sir, a provision of Rs. 2,70,000 for travelling allowance and a sum of Rs. 1,87,050 for fixed travelling allowance for sub-inspectors altogether making up a total of Rs. 4,57,050. From the revised estimate for this year we find the corresponding amount to be Rs. 3,60,000, as against a budget provision of Rs. 5,37,050. And in 1920-21 according to the actual account the amount was Rs. 2,71,647. Therefore I contend that the provision of Rs. 4,57,050 is an extraordinarily exorbitant amount. Hence I move for a reduction.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I point out, Sir, that the sum of Rs. 1,87,050 is a new item ? ”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“ I thank the hon. the Finance Member for giving the information that it is a new item. I propose to cut out 1 lakh and retain Rs. 87,050 under this provision. I submit that this question of fixed travelling allowance has been debated at length here and I need not go again into those reasons for cutting it down. The Government have also come to the rescue and have promised to reduce the travelling allowance and I only follow their own argument and request the Council to reduce the provision by only 1 lakh. Without taking up any more of your time, Sir, I move for this modest reduction.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Sir, I am sorry that my hon. Friend seeks to hit hard the very poor and hardworked servants of Government

18th March 1922]

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

namely, the class of sub-inspectors. The sub-inspectors, as the House is aware, are very hardworked people and they have to face inconvenient and dangerous situations. They have to go about and have to maintain a horse, a bicycle or a bullock bandy. They were receiving no travelling allowance before. Considering the condition of this class of people, a fixed travelling allowance was sanctioned, 25 rupees a month, hardly 14 annas a day. Therefore these sub-inspectors who have to travel miles and miles to inspect the shops and factories should in all fairness be given this fixed allowance. They were not given any travelling allowance, as I said. In the course of the revision of their establishment that we recently made, we have agreed, with the sanction of the Government of India, to fix 25 rupees as the fixed travelling allowance for these officers. The item of 1,87,050 refers therefore to the new provision made for the sub-inspectors in order to relieve them of the great trouble and in order to give them some assistance and facility in their travelling work. Hitherto there was a very justifiable complaint on their part that while every department received their increments in salaries, they had not been given similar increases. Very recently, a revised scale had been sanctioned. While revising the scale we have also given them this fixed travelling allowance. As regards the other item that goes to make up the total referred to in the motion, I may say, Sir, that the figure, as originally proposed by the Board of Revenue and by the departments, stood at Rs. 3,38,000 and we cut the figure down by 20 per cent and reduced it to Rs. 2,70,000. Hence as a reduction of 20 per cent has already been made by the Government and as the fixed travelling allowance is intended for the poorly paid and hardworked class of sub-inspectors whose work the House knows very well, I think it is necessary that the House should not attempt to reduce the provision but come to the relief of this class of officers."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I submit, Sir, that it was not my intention to cut down from the fixed travelling allowance of the sub-inspectors but the reduction proposed in my motion was calculated on both the items making up the total provision. If the hon. the Minister thinks that the reduction would hit hard the poor class of sub-inspectors, I would suggest the reduction in the rates of the travelling allowance of higher paid officers."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I have already reduced it by 20 per cent."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I think, Sir, he may go still further and reduce. If in the provision made for fixed allowances to the sub-inspectors a lakh is cut out, there would still remain 87,050 and instead of giving 25 rupees a month, let them be given only 15. I submit, Sir, that in these hard days when we find it difficult for getting money, I fail to see the reason why we should be spending money for increased travelling allowances. The hon. the Minister has told us that their pay has been revised, I think, for the better. If that is so during this year at any rate their fixed allowance can be cut short."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"In fixing the pay, we take the fixed travelling allowance into consideration."

The motion was put and lost.

[18th March 1922

Motions 226 and 227.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

226. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,57,050 for travelling allowance and fixed travelling allowance for sub-inspectors by Rs. 97,050.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

227. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,57,050 for travelling allowance and fixed travelling allowance for sub-inspectors by Rs. 33,333.*

Motion 228.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Mr. President, Sir, I beg to move—

228. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 11,440 for horse allowance by Rs. 10,000.*

“At page 50 of the budget estimate the horse allowance for the year 1920-21 is found to be Rs. 1,440 whereas this year for 1922-23 it has risen to Rs. 11,440. I do not understand the reason for the sudden and large increase and hence I move for the reduction.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, this again is a charge, I should not say, debited to salt, but entirely concerned with officers at salt factories. I think it needs no demonstration to the House that the cost of keeping a horse has increased enormously in the last few years. The assistant inspectors in charge of salt factories are required to keep horses in order that they may ride round their factories. It was found that it was imposing a heavy burden on these officers on small salaries to make them keep horses at the present enhanced rates and the Government therefore give them a horse allowance.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Has the cost of maintaining a horse grown ten times, Sir, so as to necessitate a provision ten times the previous one?”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“The hon. Member is mistaken in thinking that there has been an increase by ten times. The previous year's provision was for one or two officers in special localities who had horse allowances; what is now proposed is to give a new allowance to the assistant inspectors in salt factories who had not hitherto received any. Even now they receive not the whole cost of keeping a horse, but a portion of it.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I do not know whom the answer of the hon. the Finance Member has satisfied. Perhaps only himself. The question is whether the cost of maintaining a horse has grown to be ten times what it was before. We have heard of the Salaries Committee report and the inquiry into the rise in prices and the rise in prices in the last three years is only by three times. It is extraordinary that in the course of one year any expense should have increased by ten times.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Perhaps I have not made myself quite clear. These officers were maintaining horses out of their own pockets. Let us say that the cost of maintaining a horse has gone up three times. We are giving them an allowance of Rs. 25 which may be one-third of the whole of their expenses. They still have to meet the remaining two-thirds out of their own pockets.”

18th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“If they were maintaining their horses themselves I do not see why they should not do so this year also.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“Have they not been given corresponding increases in their pay considering the rise in prices ?”

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu moved the closure which was carried.

The motion was then put and declared lost.

A poll was demanded by the hon. Member Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao and the same was taken with the following result :—

Ayes.

1. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu.	7. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.
2. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.	8. Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar.
3. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.	9. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo.
4. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimha Charlu.	10. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
5. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.	11. Mr. M. Suryanarayana.
6. Mr. K. V. Ramachari.	

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Charles Todhunter.	25. Rao Bahadur A. Kamayya Punja.
2. The hon. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.	26. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar.
3. The hon. Mr. P. Ramarayaningar.	27. Mr. K. Sitarama Reddi.
4. The hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.	28. Mr. N. A. V. Somasundaram Pillai.
5. The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.	29. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.
6. Mr. T. E. Moir.	30. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.
7. Mr. F. J. Richards.	31. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataratnam Nayudu.
8. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.	32. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.
9. Mr. B. Littlehailes.	33. Mr. S. Muttumanicka Achari.
10. Mr. E. Periyanayagam.	34. The Zamindar of Mandasa.
11. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiar.	35. Mr. K. Prabhakaran Tampan.
12. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.	36. Mr. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib.
13. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.	37. Khan Sahib Abdur-Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur.
14. Rao Bahadur V. Appaswami Vandayar.	38. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur.
15. Diwan Bahadur C. Arunachala Mudaliyar.	39. Khan Bahadur Sayyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur.
16. Rai Bahadur P. C. Etrajulu Nayudu.	40. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Badsha Sahib Bahadur.
17. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.	41. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Usman Sahib Bahadur.
18. Rao Bahadur T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar.	42. Mr. M. C. Raja.
19. Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiar.	43. Mr. R. T. Kesavulu Pillai.
20. Mr. W. Vijayaraghava Mudaliyar.	44. Rao Sahib P. Venkatrangayya.
21. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.	45. Rao Bahadur T. Namburumal Chetti.
22. Mr. A. T. Muttukumaraswami Chettiar.	46. Mr. T. Richmond.
23. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.	
24. Mr. V. P. Pakkiriswami Pillai.	

The motion was declared lost, 11 having voted for and 46 against.

Motion 229.

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—“Mr. President, 12-30 p.m. Sir, I beg to make the following motion standing in my name :—

229. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,00,000 for petty construction and repairs by Rs. 2,00,000.”*

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“May I again raise the same point, Sir ? This allotment is practically entirely for salt works and I hope the Council would trust the Government to get the last pie they can from the Government of India on account of it.”

[18th March 1922]

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ So far as the question of the point of order is concerned, I cannot rule this out of order unless the hon. the Finance Member can assure me that the amount that is now being borne by the Government of India is over 2 lakhs. But, should it be that the Madras Government pay more than 2 lakhs, the hon. Member is entitled to move his reduction.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ Practically the whole of that allotment is for salt work.”

Dr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—“ I should like to know, Sir, whether the motion is admissible or not.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ So far as the question of admissibility is concerned, I would certainly not be justified in ruling this out of order unless the hon. the Finance Member tells us in very definite terms that the whole of that allotment or more than one half of it is being debited to the Government of India. But, at the same time, the hon. the Finance Member has told us that this question of the relative distribution of this allotment between the Government of India and this Government is going up to the Government of India and that no useful purpose will be served by discussing it just now, and he has made an appeal to the House to consider whether the resolutions of this class could not be withdrawn so as to save time and allow them to be brought up later on after the orders of the Government of India are received. So, that is a matter entirely for the hon. Member to consider. The hon. Member would be strictly in order in proceeding with the motion and if he now withdraws it, it is on his own responsibility.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 230 and 231.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. R. SRINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

230. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,00,000 for petty construction and repairs by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

231. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,32,700 for contingencies by Rs. 2,47,000.*

Motion 232.

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“ Sir, I beg to move the following :—

232. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,32,700 for contingencies by Rupees 32,700.*

“ At page 51 of the budget under revised estimate for 1921–22 Rs. 34,000 and odd has been provided for other non-contract contingencies. In the year 1922–23, Rs. 54,000 and odd has been provided, i.e., Rs. 20,000 more. Again, in addition to that, we find in the same page a provision of Rs. 33,000 for other contract contingencies. We have no idea at all as to what these contingencies mean. So it is better under the present conditions to reduce it by Rs. 32,700.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“ May I say again, Sir, that these contingencies include such things as a railway siding and the building of

18th March 1922]

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

lines in salt works? The actual ordinary contingencies of the department are comparatively small and they have been reduced by 17 per cent as compared with the revised estimate for 1921-22. In the matter of ordinary contingencies such as punkah-pullers and so on, this department is kept very tight and there is no provision anywhere, for instance, for payment of punkah-pullers out of contingencies."

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“The hon. the Finance Member says that the money is utilized for building small huts, etc. Again at page 51 under ‘Petty construction and repairs,’ Rs. 4,00,000 has been provided for. Is it in addition to that?”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“‘Petty construction and repairs’ I think, amount to $3\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“According to the budget in my hands it is 4 lakhs.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Under Salt and Excise the amount comes to Rs. 3,82,700.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“As my hon. Colleague has said, contingencies are so very strictly provided for in the budget that even the hot weather charges for the officers have been very much reduced. All these excise officers and the salt officers are always on outside duty and even the punkah allowance has been reduced. The contingencies have so far been cut down to the narrowest limit.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Last year it was only Rs. 34,000 and odd, whereas this year it is Rs. 54,000 and odd. Neither the hon. the Finance Member, nor the Minister in charge has explained that difference.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Sir, the question is there is an excess in the budget provision under the heading Contingencies. What is the reason for this excess provision? If the hon. Sir Charles Todhunter, or the hon. the Minister in charge explains the reason for this excess provision, the House will be satisfied. We know that the Government has done its best to curtail all contingent charges.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, the budget provision for petty construction and repairs for 1922-23 is Rs. 4,00,000. In the revised estimate for 1921-22, it is Rs. 2,98,000 which is wholly debited to Salt. The present increase to Rs. 4,00,000 would again be wholly debited to Salt. Hence you find an increase in the contingencies. In addition to what we have already cut down, the increase which is found now under the heading ‘Petty construction and repairs’ is debited to Salt.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“I withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 233.

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“Mr. President, I beg leave to make the following motion :—

233. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30,19,000 by Rs. 50,000.*

“This Council will admit the propriety of dealing tenderly with this department which has always added to the revenues of this province, but which of late has been hard hit, and, for the first time in its history, shows

[Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

[18th March 1922]

a deficit of over 70 lakhs. This will appear all the more necessary when it is remembered that despite this loss the hon. the Minister in charge has effected economy, has been able to show even greater economy than other departments. If, nevertheless, I press for a reduction of the total grant by Rs. 50,000, it is, Sir, on a question of principle, on a question of policy, which, I carefully considered and allowed a fair trial, will, I hope, eventually result in even greater economy. Till now the attention of this House has been confined to reducing establishment charges, to cutting down allowances, etc. I think, Sir, it will be profitable to consider whether we cannot enter into the internal organization, the inner working of a department, the system of work and the methods which have been consecrated by tradition and usage, whether, for instance, the amount of correspondence that is carried on in a department, or between the several departments cannot be reduced, whether it is necessary to call for so many returns as are now insisted upon, whether the papers should pass through so many hands, initialled by so many, running the risk of being lost or locked up in some drawer and then released and allowed to continue their journey. Applying these remarks to Excise, I would say that it is clear from the words of the hon. the Minister, that deputy commissioners have sometimes to hasten to the help of the revenue officers. There seems to be a kind of duplication. That is, the revenue officers have the auctioning and the collection of revenue and I believe they travel over, for revenue purposes, the very places which are visited, for abkari purposes, by the deputy commissioners and assistant commissioners. I think there must be some correspondence carried on between these two departments, and some compilation of statistics. Is it necessary for us to maintain this duplication? Again, I heard the hon. the Minister say that we cannot cut down the number of inspectors. You would, Sir, rule me out of order were I to speak of the inspectors in the Salt department, but confining my remarks to the Abkari sub-inspectors, I believe the work of inspection in regard to the tapping of trees is done by the sub-inspectors, and the assistant inspectors and the inspectors supervise their work or help them. Strictly speaking, there is not much difference between the work done by sub-inspectors and that done by assistant inspectors; and as regards the Commissioners and inspectors, most of their work consists, I believe, in supervision. If the hon. the Minister for Education would, in consultation with the hon. the Finance Member, hold an inquiry, he will, I doubt not, evolve a unified and simplified system instead of maintaining this duplicate system of compiling statistics and having the very same work done on parallel lines. It would also be possible for him to show a good deal of saving under this head. We cannot have a better authority on this subject than the hon. the Finance Member who was connected with this department for a number of years, and I also think the hon. the Minister finds himself quite at home in this department and if he would only tackle the problem with his wonted energy and resourcefulness, it should be possible for him, in concert with his colleagues and with the sanction of the Central Government to evolve a simpler system which would permit of a saving being shown. In this spirit, Sir, with a view to call the attention of the House to the internal method of work carried on in this branch of administration, I move this resolution. As I have already stated, Sir, I am not unmindful of the economy shown by the hon. the Minister, not unmindful of the strain imposed upon his staff and of the difficulties under which they carry on their work; for, as I have heard him remark, they are placed between two sets of persons, one class who try to paralyse their work

18th March 1922] | Mr. S. Arpudaswami Udaiyar]

by means of picketing, another class of philanthropists and social reformers who, with the very best of intentions, nevertheless charge them with encouraging drinking which it is their object to discourage by putting an end to illicit distillation and by reducing drink to the very narrowest limit compatible with individual liberty. I am not unmindful of all these. Nevertheless, I think, Sir, if the attention of the House will be directed to the internal working of this branch of administration, it should be possible for the department to show some saving."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“Sir, I appreciate the principle underlying the resolution. My hon. colleague the Finance Member has already indicated that with regard to the accounts between the Salt and the Excise department, it is engaging his attention and that the Central Government will be approached in course of time. As regards the separation of the two departments altogether, we do not know where we shall be after the accounts are formally passed. That is also another matter which is being investigated and the opinions of the heads of departments are being called for. Then as regards the work of the various officers overlapping and all that, I shall certainly bear that in mind as it requires closer examination and go into the matter thoroughly as opportunity arises.”

Mr. S. ARPUDASWAMI UDAIYAR :—“If I want to press this resolution, it is only with a view to give the Government some stimulus or incentive to this inquiry being made, because it is human for persons with the best of intentions to postpone such work or not think seriously of it for lack of the necessary stimulus. Therefore, I press my motion to a division.”

The motion was put and lost.

Motions 234 and 235.

12-45 p.m. The following motions were not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

234. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29,65,049 for Excise (Provincial) by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

235. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29,65,049 for Excise (Provincial) by Rs. 50,000.*

Motion 236.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“I move—

236. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 29,65,049 for Excise (Provincial) by Rs. 100.*

“I shall confine my remarks to only one point in connexion with this. The hon. the Minister says that he is going to convene a committee which will go into the question of excise administration in this Presidency and decide what our future policy should be. It would be within the recollection of the members of this House that in August last the House discussed the question of the reduction of the intoxicants in this Presidency and even total prohibition. In connexion with that the hon. the Minister assured the House that he would appoint a standing committee to whom he would refer this question and that he would favourably consider any recommendation that might be made by that committee. But instead of appointing such a

[Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar] [18th March 1922]

committee, Sir, he has appointed an advisory committee. I asked some time ago why an advisory committee was appointed instead of a standing committee. No answer was vouchsafed for that question. There is a considerable difference between the powers and functions of a standing committee and those of an advisory committee. The standing committee would be a committee of the House in which the members of the House would sit and I think the information available to the members of the standing committee would be available to the House as well. When you appoint an advisory committee instead of a standing committee, that privilege is taken away. We are anxious to obtain full responsible government. We want to train ourselves as far as possible and as quickly as we can in parliamentary practice and it passes my comprehension, Sir, why, when there is a provision for standing committees, when it was definitely accepted by the Minister, instead of giving effect to it, the hon. the Minister should have gone out of the way and given an advisory committee. We have a right to look to our popular representatives here, the Ministers, to the establishment of sound traditions. I think we have a right to look up to them to see that our privileges are fully maintained."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"I do not know how, to reply. Yesterday evening my friend sent a chit to say that he would raise two points and he did not include the present point in those two points. I do not know to what point I am to reply now."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I just followed, Sir, the advice given by you and sent a chit. I think I mentioned this point also there. It may be that this has not been included. Anyhow this is not a new question sprung upon him, because I have already referred to it in one of my speeches."

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO:—"Now with reference to the difference between the standing committees and the advisory committees, I only wish to refer the House to the history of it. It was found that the standing committees could not be constituted unless by a resolution of the House. So these were committees appointed by His Excellency the Governor in exercise of the power conferred on him. I only wish to recall to the memory of the hon. Member what took place when the standing committees were formed. If he does not remember I am very sorry for him. The matter was left to the joint committee and it was found that an advisory committee would be more satisfactory than standing committees. Hence the advisory committee was appointed. I do not know if even the Finance Committee could be called a standing committee under the statute. Therefore we resolved, after a full consideration of the whole matter, that an advisory committee would be quite sufficient to meet the needs of the situation. Whenever there is a question of policy or a question of expenditure, these matters are placed before the advisory committees. Recently I have had occasion to consult the Public Works Committee, the Registration Committee and the Education Committee. These committees are meeting from time to time. My hon. Friend himself is on the Excise Committee and the Public Works Department Committee. He also attended some meetings and on another occasion he was late as he was engaged on another committee. Therefore the Ministers are taking the members into full confidence and whatever advice they give is very carefully considered and given effect to as far as possible."

18th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I have not got very much to say by way of reply. I appeal to the popular part of the Government to see that steps are taken if necessary to bring about the standing committees. That is all. If you will consider that aspect of the question I will withdraw the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 237 to 239.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

237. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 29,65,049 for Excise (Provincial) by Rs. 50,000*

Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—

238. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 43,64,930 for salaries, establishments, etc., by Rs. 50,000.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

239. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 43,64,930 for salaries, establishments, etc., by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Motion 240.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I move—

240. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 44,32,930 for salaries, establishments, etc., including Agency division by Rs. 50,000.*

“ As suggested by Mr. Arpudaswami Udayar, it is a matter of necessity that the House should make some reductions. No doubt we are aware that attempts have been made at reduction in the Excise department, but considering the financial position of our province I think some more reductions ought to be made. So in every item we should like to have some reduction. It may be said that there is no use of merely saying that reductions should be made without showing the ways as to how they could be done. There are questions like travelling allowances, duty allowances and personal allowances. These matters may be investigated. Of course we do not want to go into the details. We will leave it to the departments and the Minister concerned to go into the details. Then there are the deputy commissioners, the assistant inspectors and things of that sort as regards whose abolition notices of motion were given. I do not want to raise any specific question with regard to this grant now. As was suggested yesterday it will not be proper to raise new questions without any discussion beforehand. So I thought that if there are any separate issues they could be raised in the form of resolutions later on. I hope the hon. Minister will agree to this reduction.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ I am sorry my hon. Friend has proposed to make such a large reduction as Rs. 50,000. In the course of my remarks on the other motions I have showed how it is impossible in the Excise department to cut down any further. From the budget statement it is quite clear to hon. Members that I tried to reduce officers as many as possible. Also in the matter of expenditure I tried my best to reduce as much as I could. I have received an intimation from the Board of Revenue that even the reductions will go a long way to discourage officers and that the

[Mr. A. P. Patro]

[18th March 1922]

efficiency of the services will be affected if any further reduction be made. Hon. Members will remember that the Excise department brings in a revenue of $5\frac{1}{2}$ crores whereas the expenditure is only 6 per cent of the revenue that we realize from this department. I appeal to hon. Members to consider whether a department which brings in a revenue of 5 crores and odd is or is not fairly managed when the expenditure is only 6 per cent. Therefore it is impossible to make any reduction in that. But as my hon. Friend has been pressing that I should meet the wishes of the Council and that further reduction should be made to what has already been done, I may agree if the amount is reduced to about Rs. 30,000. Then I suppose with great difficulty we may be able to persuade the departments to carry on their work."

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“ In view of what has fallen from the lips of my hon. Colleague, may I, Sir, with your permission and the permission of the House beg to move an amendment, viz., ‘ Substitute 30,19,000 in the place of 44,32,930 and 30,000 in the place of 50,000 ’. The object, Sir, is that this figure of 44 lakhs and odd represents the expenditure on salt as well as excise. Salt being a department of the Government of India it is not possible to make any reduction or to meddle with it. At page 51 the figure for excise alone is given. The Minister for Excise has agreed for a reduction of Rs. 30,000 and I submit that this is the proper method of dealing with it.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I agree to the amendment.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ Are amendments allowed regarding grants and motions on grants ? ”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Ordinarily it would be unnecessary. The hon. Member’s motion includes non-votable items. So, instead of ruling it out, I allowed it more in the interests of the motion.”

The amendment of the hon. Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu was put and carried.

The motion as amended, namely, to reduce Rs. 30,19,000 by Rs. 30,000, was also put and carried.

Motion 241.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I move—

241. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 44,32,930 for salaries, establishments, etc., including Agency division by Rs. 32,160.*

“ I just move it formally with a view to invite your attention to page 51 of the budget.”

Mr. A. RAMASWAMI MUDALIYAR :—“ In view of the last motion which has been carried, how could this resolution be in order ? There are the same figures ? ”

1 p.m. The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ The House has decided to reduce the allotment by Rs. 30,000, not by Rs. 32,160.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ On page 51 it is mentioned, Sir, that the amount to be voted is Rs. 44,32,930.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Against net provincial share the amount mentioned is Rs. 30,19,000.”

18th March 1922]

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ I do not want to press my motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 242 to 244.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

242. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30.38 lakhs under Demand II by Rs. 50,000.*

Mr. V. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—

243. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30.38 lakhs under Demand II by Rs. 6 lakhs.*

Mr. N. A. V. SOMASUNDARAM PILLAI :—

244. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 30.38 lakhs under Demand II by Rs. 1 lakh.*

Demand II was put and the grant made, subject to a reduction of Rs. 30,000.

DEMAND III—STAMPS.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ I beg to move, Sir, Demand III—Stamps, for a grant not exceeding 5.38 lakhs of rupees. This includes the expenditure both in England and in India. Details will be found on page 5 of the statement which is in the hands of hon. Members; and I am happy to announce that no motion has been received for reduction of this demand.”

Demand III was put and carried. The grant was made.

DEMAND IV—FOREST.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON moved for a grant not exceeding 42.52 lakhs under Demand IV—Forest department. In doing so, he said :—

“ I wish I could say, like my hon. Colleague, that no motions for reduction of the grant have been received under this demand. But it is not the case; for there are about 50 motions, though there is of course a good deal of reduplication. The total amount of the demand as shown at page 1 of the list of demands for grants is 42.52 lakhs. That figure covers not only the forest expenditure proper but also forest refunds, and the manner in which the total is arrived at is shown at page 5 of the same list of demands. It excludes Agency forest outlay, which will be dealt with separately, under Demand XXXIII. Before sitting down I propose to devote a few minutes to the general issues of forest policy raised in the grant for the coming year; for, it is a year of exceptional importance in the history of the department.

“ I need not at this moment refer at all to the question of forest panchayat scheme, because there is a specific motion for the omission of Rs. 30,000 provided on that account, which will afford an opportunity for discussion. I will refer mainly, but not solely, to the question of the development of the Forest department on modern lines. But I should here premise that, where as it is the custom in certain quarters to criticise the outlay on the Forest department as if it were solely a commercial department, the department in fact serves two objects and commercial profit is only one of them; it also

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

serves the very important economic purpose of the conservancy and protection of existing forest assets—assets not from the standpoint of potentialities of revenue so much as from the standpoint of protection against famine and the general agricultural and economic convenience of the ryot population of the Presidency. I draw special attention to this consideration in order to make it clear that I cannot accept without question figures based on comparisons of total outlay with surplus realized. It is perfectly true that at the end of the general discussion I myself descended to that plane for the purpose of answering criticisms of that nature and I then showed that during the past 30 years—for it is unfair to take only single year—the average return was something like 40 per cent. If we could exclude the proportion of the expenditure during that 30-year period which was devoted to conservancy and protection on agricultural and economic grounds as distinguished from commercial outlay, the return would be very much higher.

“ Now I want the Council to realize that the present proposals for outlay on modern lines under the supervision of skilled experts are the direct outcome of the appointment of a Chief Conservator which was made in 1919. One of the first subjects to which Mr. Cox devoted his attention was the great possibilities which were facing him in regard to the development of his department. Those possibilities were forced upon him by the practical experience of the war, when facts were brought to notice showing that notwithstanding our enormous reserves of valuable timber, we had not been in a position to place anything more than a negligible quantity at the disposal of the army. It became clear that this was mainly due to the old-fashioned methods of exploitation in force. The Government of India had become alive to this consideration independently of the conditions of the Madras Presidency, and in consultation with the Secretary of State, they took the step of engaging the services of two American gentlemen of very great practical experience in the lumbering methods in vogue in the United States—Mr. Lafon and Mr. Martin. We have had the benefit of Mr. Martin’s skilled advice on the subject and we much hope that we shall continue to retain his advice and also secure his personal services in the future. That is one of the issues which I wish the Council to decide in the course of the debates on the motions for the reduction of this grant.

“ Mr. Martin’s colleague Mr. Lafon has in similar circumstances been definitely engaged for a period of service in the Punjab by an arrangement which will give him an aggregate remuneration of Rs. 4,000 a month as distinguished from the Rs. 3,000 a month which we contemplate in the case of Mr. Martin. Mr. Lafon’s time will be divided between service directly under the Punjab Government and service with a timber exploitation company. There is no reason to suppose that Mr. Martin is in any way professionally inferior to the other gentleman, but he is an enthusiastic worker and one of the considerations which has induced him to consent, subject to the approval of this Council and the Secretary of State, to serve in Madras is that he is emphatically desirous of proving the truth of the forecasts which he has made as to the possibilities of development of the Madras forests. It is not only Malabar that is in issue. There are also vast and valuable forest areas in South Kanara, the most recent information with regard to which is of a most interesting nature, though I do not propose to trouble the Council with that at present. I have myself been to Tinnevelly to examine superficially the possibilities of the same nature in large forest

18th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

tracts in that district; there is no doubt that there too there is great scope for development, and I might equally cite the Agency forests, if further illustration were needed.

“Criticism has been directed against the Chenat Nayar scheme on the ground that during the first year or two the current working expenses have resulted in a loss of about Rs. 4,000. Sir, I would at the first instance merely reply that in regard to a large scheme of this description, it is quite unfair to base conclusions on the experience of only one or two years. I will next mention that, as one of the Members of my advisory committee, a gentleman of wide business experience, Mr. Namburam Chettiar, has pointed out, even that little deficit of Rs. 4,000 is not in fact real, since on the debit side there is included an item of Rs. 8,047, being the cost of sending free sample consignments to the Kolar mines and other miscellaneous work, which in his business judgment is an item debitable not to current working expenses but to the capital account. Finally I must insist that the real value of these experiments lies in the fact that they have conclusively demonstrated the possibility of extracting valuable timber from evergreen forests, hundreds of square miles in extent, which were hitherto believed to be inaccessible for purposes of exploitation. I may also add that if the initial working has proved, comparatively speaking, to be costly, that is in no small measure due to the fact that we were lacking in the expert supervision necessary to conduct such operations. It is to remedy that defect that we now propose to employ an expert of Mr. Martin's calibre.

“There is another aspect of the case and that is the bearing which 1-15 p.m. these new developments have upon the continuance in service of our senior forest officers, particularly the conservators upon whose shoulders will devolve most of the responsible work of framing schemes for development on the new lines, under the supervision, of course, of the Chief Forest Engineer, for without that supervision our conservators would not be competent to frame sound business schemes. I think it would be very much to be deprecated if, by the Council's action in turning down these great developments, the senior officers of the department and also those who in due time look to taking their places should be permeated with the idea that their future life in the Forest department will continue on the humdrum lines of the past. To a forest officer who is keen on his profession the new developments are most attractive. That is a general aspect of the case which I commend to the consideration of the Council.

“In regard to the general cuts of the Forest department budget, which are proposed in various motions, I should like to draw prominent attention to the fact that we have already cut out very nearly five lakhs from the Chief Conservator's own budget owing to the insistence of the Finance department. I wish also to draw the attention of the Council to the course adopted by the hon. Members of the Legislative Assembly, particularly an old member of this body, Rao Bahadur T. Ranga Achariyar. Hon. Members who read the newspapers will have noticed that in the Legislative Assembly there has been a reduction of 5 per cent in practically every grant in the Government of India's budget. But I observe that Mr. Ranga Achariyar with the unanimous approval of his supporters made a definite exception in the case of two departments; one of these departments was the Forest department, which Mr. Ranga Achariyar announced amidst applause was a great national

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

asset and should bring in sufficient revenue to relieve the tax-payer of his existing burdens. That, Sir, is a general consideration which I hope hon. Members of this Council will bear in mind when we are discussing this grant."

Motion 245.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

245. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 as duty allowance for the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator.*

"Sir, this is a question which is not new to this Council. Last year this was debated upon. It has been argued from the Government's side that it has been in existence for a long time and it is necessary that on account of the duties he has to discharge, he shall be paid this allowance. I believe he belongs to the rank of deputy collectors whose salaries have been recently raised and in the opinion of some at least the salaries thus raised are very high. This House has already resolved yesterday that personal allowances and presidency allowances should not be given. While tracing its origin the hon. the Home Member referred to the experience of the present Secretary while he was in the Board of Revenue, and showed how the duties of the personal assistant connected with this work are very arduous. I believe, Sir, a public servant is expected to devote all his time and all his energies to the best of his ability for the salary he is engaged. I do not think there will be any justification for paying him more on the ground that his work is more arduous. A pathetic appeal was made yesterday by one of the members of the Civil Service regarding these duty allowances and I am not able to understand the spirit in which he made that appeal. The salaries have been raised enormously without having any regard to the condition of the province in the matter of revenues and the new scale of system introduced is too heavy to meet the growing cost by the expansion of the revenues. When such is the case, I submit that greater attention is to be paid to the opinion of this House than to any feeling expressed by the members of the service. We as representatives of the people do feel more for the taxpayers, though the hon. Member who represented the class of service might feel equally well for the high salaries of his colleagues. With these words, Sir, I commend this motion for the acceptance of this House."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"Sir, my hon. Friend Mr. Narasimha Raju has referred to the discussion which took place on precisely the same issue last year. I am glad to notice from the record of the debate on that occasion that the Council voted for the continuance of this duty allowance by 40 as against 12 and I appeal to the Council, Sir, to repeat that vote. It seems to me that the line of criticism which is based on the supposed over-payment of deputy collectors in general is really irrelevant to the issue whether a duty allowance should be given to this particular officer. If the over-payment view commends itself to this Council, the proper remedy clearly is to revise the scale of pay of deputy collectors, and not to deprive an officer, who accepted a particular appointment on the faith that it would carry with it a duty allowance of Rs. 200, of that duty allowance. The case for this particular allowance depends partly upon compulsory residence in the expensive Presidency town and partly upon the special measure of

18th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

responsibility imposed upon the incumbent of the post. In regard to the general issue of Presidency allowances, it is possible that my hon. Colleague the Finance Member may wish to say a few words, but if he does not, I would again urge that this particular allowance should not be cancelled without a proper consideration of the whole wide issue of Presidency allowances. There is nothing, Sir, which I can add to this general statement of the case and I do not propose to repeat the detailed arguments which I adduced last year. If, as seems to be the case, such arguments do not commend themselves to the Council when brought forward in connexion with such questions as the reduction of duty allowances or travelling allowances, it seems to me, Sir, that appeals to a sense of logic and reason are to some extent thrown away; but in a case like this there are very strong reasons to continue the duty allowance and I think they ought to appeal to all fair-minded men."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Sir, very poor compliment has been paid by the hon. the Home Member to the sense of appreciation of this House by saying that appeals based upon logic and good sense will not be appreciated by some of the members of this House.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“In these matters.”

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“Sir, I may also tell the hon. the Home Member that appeals from this House do not appear to be appreciated by the Government when we base our arguments mostly on the highly increased salaries that have now come into existence and on the poor condition of the tax-payers. If anything can appeal to this House it is the condition of the poor tax-payer and not the condition of the already well-paid official. It shall not be understood by the country that we are here simply to give our support to the already well-paid officials. We are here to safeguard and watch the conditions on behalf of the tax-payers. It is that which appeals to us and not the way in which the Government proposes to spend away the revenues of the province in filling up the pockets of the already well-paid services.”

The hon. Sir CHARLES TODHUNTER :—“Sir, I have already told the House why allowances are granted and that unnecessary allowances are as much anathema to me as they are to them, and I hope that I can fully enter into the feelings of hon. Members who think that some of these allowances are not fully justified, but I do appeal to the House to see that this is a question which can only be fairly settled on examination of the details. The allowances are given for various reasons. I gave an instance yesterday of an allowance which arose out of the revision of the scale of an appointment which was converted from one on special pay to a post on a general cadre with an allowance to equalize matters, the net result being no increase in charges. I have already stated that every one of these allowances has been sanctioned only after careful examination and enquiry, and I do venture to think that if any of them is to be withdrawn, it should be withdrawn only after full examination of the reasons for which it was given. Here I would venture to refer to what has passed in this matter in the Finance Committee. I appeal to the members of the Finance Committee to confirm me when I say that it has been my conscientious endeavour to lay before them every possible scrap of information that they desired to examine on such matters,

[Sir Charles Todhunter]

[18th March 1922]

and I have asked them again and again not to be content with a general condemnation of allowances or of a class of allowances, but to take up specific cases and examine the reasons why the allowances were given and to give their grounds for cutting out these allowances so that the whole case may be placed before the Cabinet for their decision, after considering both sides of the case. I venture to appeal to the House that, if they want to cut out allowances, the proper course for the House is to let the Finance Committee examine and state each case to the Cabinet so that the Cabinet may decide the matter.

"As I have already stated, Sir, the reserved part of this Government are responsible in such matters to the Secretary of State, and with reference to what has been said about Presidency allowances, I should like to say that quite recently we have had a despatch from the Secretary of State, not condemning Presidency allowances, but asking for proposals for extending those which are granted in Calcutta and Bombay to other cities, not only headquarter places like Madras but also up-country towns where the expenses of living are high. I ask the Council to consider the position of the reserved half of the Government when they have instructions of this sort from the Secretary of State, while they are pressed by the Council on the other hand to cut down the allowances. I do not wish to say anything about the particular allowance which is now in question, but I do ask the House generally when dealing with the question of allowances to give us an opportunity to place before the Finance Committee every possible piece of information as to the reasons why these allowances were thought necessary and to let the Finance Committee pass a considered opinion upon all the facts instead of asking the House to vote on a presentation of the case which cannot be complete."

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—“I oppose this motion, Sir. I cannot understand why so much is said against all these allowances.

1-30 p.m. It is rarely that these allowances are unnecessary; and in some cases they are a matter of dire necessity. If there are a certain number of clerks in an office in various grades of pay and one of them is made to act as head clerk, should he not get an allowance to supervise the work of others in addition to his own clerical duties? If there are professors on various grades of pay and if one of them is appointed Principal, should he not get a duty allowance for doing administrative work in addition to lecturing work? If there are physicians and surgeons in the General Hospital, and if some of them are appointed lecturers in the Medical College, should they not receive duty allowance for doing teaching work in addition to their general work? If there are some medical officers who are appointed to posts, the incumbents of which cannot have private practice, should they not get an allowance to compensate for what they could have got in the way of private practice? Moreover, there are deputy collectors all over the presidency on various grades of pay; and if we want a deputy collector of proved ability for conducting the affairs of a department comprising the work of the whole presidency, should we not pay these men duty allowances for doing laborious and very responsible work? It is not all the deputy collectors that want to have the privilege of living in Madras. In fact, I know many of them would like to have a pleasant time in the mufassal. This Rs. 200 allowance is the only attraction for them to accept posts in Madras. For Madras is a very

18th March 1922]

[Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar]

costly place and the Rs. 200 allowance barely covers the house-rent and conveyance charges. I am willing to reduce the pay of the highly paid officers all round according to a resolution passed in this Council, but the extra work should be paid for by an extra allowance."

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—“Sir, yesterday we passed a motion that the presidency allowance should be cut down; and when a motion to cut down a similar allowance to a particular officer is brought we should support that motion. I am one of those who were for retaining this allowance last year, because we could not possibly cut down the same allowance in the case of other officers. Now that we succeeded in reducing the duty allowance of other officers, I regret I cannot agree with the view of Mr. Natesan. Sir, the hon. the Finance Member says that he is bound by the instructions received from the Secretary of State with regard to allowances for other officers. That might be. We therefore sympathise with him. We cannot but cut down what this Council can possibly cut down, so that it can be reported to the Secretary of State and the same might be done in the case of officers with whose allowance we cannot interfere. No doubt it is a loss to Indians if their allowance is cut down; but we want to do so in order that the same might be done in the case of higher officers in course of time, if not at once. Therefore I hope that the Council will accept the motion for reduction.”

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—“Sir, my hon. Friend Mr. Natesan is confounding duty allowance with the allowances given in lieu of private practice. If a surgeon is not allowed private practice he is generally allowed something in lieu of private practice that cannot be compared with duty allowance; but if an officer acts as personal assistant to the Conservator he is given Rs. 200 for doing nothing more than what he would otherwise have to do. The pay of the physicians and surgeons is fixed with the understanding that he could have private practice, and at the same time if a physician is asked to do lecturing work in the Medical College, he is asked to do a different kind of work and then it will be called as ‘teaching allowance’.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I want to support the motion on one or two grounds. Yesterday, in spite of the passionate appeal of Mr. Moir and others that the duty allowance should be continued, the House decided that it should be abolished in the case of the officers of the Revenue Department. Certainly we should not do one thing for the officers of the Revenue Department and another for the officers of the Forest Department. If the position of any officer is difficult, it is that of the settlement officer who may have to do work in a malarial tract but not that of an officer serving in Madras as the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator. If the appointment is to be held by a responsible person, the proper person should be selected for the purpose. It was contended by Mr. Moir or some other European Member on behalf of the Government that so far as the Indian officers are concerned they may like to be in Madras, but not so the European officers.”

Mr. T. E. MOIR :—“I made no such statement, Sir.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I added by saying ‘or by some other European Member on behalf of the Government.’

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [18th March 1922]

The question should not be whether a person likes to go to Madras or not. If it is left to the preference of the officers they may not like to leave a particular place or to go to a particular place all through their life. If particular officers do not like Madras and are posted here it is only their lot. To make a differentiation between the officers of the Revenue and of the Forest Departments, to grant the allowance to the officers of the Forest Department and to refuse it to the officers of the Revenue Department will lay the Council open to the charge of inconsistency. Therefore, in view of the fact that reduction has been made in the case of the officers of the Revenue Department, we must all vote unanimously for this motion also."

Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataraman Nayudu moved that the question be then put. The motion for the closure was carried.

The main motion for the omission of the allotment of Rs. 2,400 as duty allowance for the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator was then put to the vote and carried.

A poll was demanded by the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson, and the same was taken with the following result:—

Ayes.

1. Mr. K. Adinarayana Reddi.	22. Mr. K. V. Ramachari.
2. Dr. M. Appalanarasayya Nayudu.	23. Rao Bakadur C. B. Rama Rao.
3. Rao Bahadur K. Gopalakrishnayya.	24. Rao Sahib U. Rama Rao.
4. Mr. S. T. Shanmukham Pillai.	25. Mr. A. Kanganatha Mudaliyar.
5. Rao Bahadur T. Balaji Rao Nayudu.	26. Sriman Biswanath Das Mahasayo.
6. " T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar.	27. Mr. M. R. Seturatnam Ayyar.
7. Mr. B. Muniswami Nayudu.	28. Mr. M. Suryanarayana Pantulu.
8. Mr. A. T. Mutukumaraswami Chettiar.	29. Mr. T. Arumainatha Pillai.
9. Rao Bahadur A. Ramayya Ponja.	30. Mr. A. T. Palmer.
10. Mr. K. Sarabha Reddi.	31. Mr. K. Prathakaran Tampan.
11. Mr. W. P. A. Saundara Pandia Nadar.	32. Abbas Ali Khan Bahadur.
12. Mr. K. Sitaram Reddi.	33. A. D. M. Bavotti Sahib Bahadur.
13. Mr. T. Somasundaram Mudaliyar.	34. Sayyid Muhammad Badsha Sahib Bahadur.
14. Mr. A. Tangavelu Nayagar.	35. Khan Sahib Abdur Rahim Khan Sahib Bahadur.
15. Mr. P. Venkatasubba Rao.	36. Munshi Muhammad Abdur-Rahman Sahib Bahadur.
16. Diwan Bahadur M. Krishnan Nayar.	37. Khan Bahadur Muhammad Sadulla Padsha Sahib Bahadur.
17. Rao Bahadur A. S. Krishna Rao Pantulu.	38. Sayyid Diwan Abdul Razzaq Sahib Bahadur.
18. Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar.	
19. Sriman Sasi Bhushana Rath Mahasayo.	
20. Rai Bahadur T. M. Narasimhacharlu.	
21. Rao Bahadur C. V. S. Narasimha Raju.	

Noes.

1. The hon. Sir Lionel Davidson.	12. Mr. E. Periyanayagam.
2. " Sir Charles Todhunter.	13. Mr. R. K. Shanmukham Chettiar.
3. " Khan Bahadur Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib Bahadur.	14. Mr. A. Ramaswami Mudaliyar.
4. " Mr. K. Srinivasa Ayyangar.	15. Mr. R. Appaswami Nayudu.
5. " Mr. P. Ramarayaningar.	16. Rao Bahadur P. C. Etrajulu Nayudu.
6. " Rai Bahadur K. Venkata Reddi Nayudu.	17. Mr. C. Natesa Mudaliyar.
7. Rao Bahadur A. P. Patro.	18. Mr. S. Somasundaram Pillai.
8. Mr. T. E. Moir.	19. Mr. T. C. Tangavelu Pillai.
9. Mr. F. J. Richards.	20. Diwan Bahadur R. Venkataraman Nayudu.
10. Mr. C. W. E. Cotton.	21. Mr. G. Vandananam.
11. Mr. R. Littlehailes.	22. Rao Sahib P. Venkataramayya.
	23. Rao Bahadur T. Namberumal Chettiar.

The motion was carried, 38 having voted *for* and 23 *against*.

18th March 1922]

Motions 246 and 247.

The following motions fell through as they raised substantially the same issue as the previous motion :—

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI :—

246. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for duty allowance for the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator.*

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

247. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 2,400 for duty allowance for the Personal Assistant to the Chief Conservator.*

Motion 248.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

248. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 43,565 for salaries by 10,000.*

“I should like to elicit some information as to how the budget estimate of Rs. 43,565 under salaries was arrived at while the revised estimate for 1921-1922 is only Rs. 42,000. Is it due to the appointment of additional officers or is it due to increase in the salaries of the officers concerned ?”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, I am not able to understand what information the hon. Member wants. Practically the effect of his motion would be the abolition of the personal assistant to the Chief Conservator ; for nearly all the rest of the allotment for salaries is non-votable, namely, the pay of the Chief Conservator, which is Rs. 33,000. If therefore this House reduces the allotment of Rs. 43,565 by a sum of Rs. 10,000 as proposed, this would entail the abolition of the post of the personal assistant. Possibly the small increase which has exercised the hon. Member so much is due to the fact that these two officers are on incremental pay.”

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—“I do not press the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 249 and 250.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

249. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 8,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 800.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—

250. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,02,000 for general direction by Rs. 100.*

Motion 251.

1-45 p.m. **Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR** :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

251. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,02,000 for general direction by Rs. 100.*

“Sir, I want to raise a specific question of which I have already informed the hon. the Leader of the House. So far as the administration is concerned, I do not want to deal with the various difficulties which the Provincial service people are labouring under. So far as the appointment of conservators are concerned, I want to know whether it will not be desirable to

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [18th March 1922]

appoint one from the provincial service or one of those that have been promoted to the Imperial from the Provincial service to one post as Conservator of Forests. I know that at the fag end of the session last year this question was raised by means of a resolution, but it was withdrawn. I would just mention one or two points for the consideration of the House as well as of the Chief Conservator of Forests. That is in view of the fact that the number of four conservators has now been raised to six, whether it is not possible to have one of these appointments listed for the Provincial forest service or to people who have been taken from the Provincial into the Imperial. Hon. Members are aware that originally all recruitments to Imperial service were in England. Now most of them are recruited either in England or in India and are appointed after training in England. Seven officers have been promoted from the provincial forest service to the Imperial forest service. We are doubtful as to whether their position has been bettered by their promotion there. While there was increment of three grades to the people who have remained in the provincial forest service, no such increment is given to the people who have been promoted to the Imperial forest service. As matters stand, it will be absolutely impossible for any one in the provincial service or any one of the Imperial service that has been promoted from the provincial to become a Conservator of Forests. There are about 12 people above the seniors among them, and it will take them 12 years to reach even to the grade of Rs. 1,350. All the men above are younger and there is no likelihood of there being any vacancy so far as these people are concerned.

"It has been suggested deliberately by the Leader of the House in the last discussion on this point that not even one of these people will ever be fit to be a Conservator. We were told yesterday that the curtailment of 10 or 20 rupees in allowances would cause great hardship and discontent among all provincial service people. I ask whether it is fair to say that all these people are inefficient and not one of them could be found to occupy the place of a Conservator. Is this not likely to cause discontent? I am sure we will be told again now that not one of them is fit for the post of Conservator of Forests. I will take the case of one officer who is in the Travancore service as the head of the department. He is a non-Brahman and his name is Mr. Raman Menon. He has been selected by the Government and his services have been lent to the Travancore Government. Is it fair to say that he is not fit to hold the post of Conservator of Forests here? Is it fair in such a case to say that unless he is trained in England he will not be able to do the Conservator's work well? Sir, it is too late for us to say that English training is much better than Indian training. So far as the five hon. Members of the Cabinet opposite are concerned, they have no English training; and for appointment of Collectors, Judges, High Court Judges and even Revenue Board Members no English training is considered necessary. But the Leader of the House would say that no one without English training is ever likely to be appointed as a Conservator. Why is English training essential? Is it because we, in India, have got a number of trees that do not grow in England, such as our teak, devadar, irul and other varieties, but do not have trees such as the oak, cedar, etc., that grow in England? So far as forest administration is concerned, people in England learnt forestry by going to Germany and other places. In England the training has commenced to be given only recently, whereas if you look into the history of

18th March 1922] [Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar]

India on this subject you will find that the first Conservator in the Madras Presidency was appointed in 1856. We in India have got a very old history. I consider it is the training in India that is necessary more than in England. Even the publications supplied by the Government of India clearly show that the forest administration of India is an example to be followed by other countries. So to be told that people with a good many years of training in this part of the country are not fit to be appointed as Conservators is certainly too much. I have made these representations to the Leader of the House, and I trust that he will take them into his consideration and see that out of the six appointments one is made a listed post. The question of finance may come in also in the case of lower pay. I do not think that people on Rs. 700 or 800 will insist on getting a high pay. So far as the present Conservators are concerned, some of them were all newly appointed after having been once superseded, and the claims of the Indian trained people have been ignored.

"The Leader of the House said yesterday that he would be leaving us very soon. Let him try to remedy what is considered to be an injustice in regard to the people in the Forest Department before he leaves us.

"So far as this training is concerned I have consulted several people. I have heard of Mr. Raman Menon himself in connexion with this question, one of the best persons in the Forest Department. I may say that this matter has created great discontent among the Provincial Forest officers. Many of the publications refer to the good work done by the Indian officers. All this will be a pretension and a sham unless the rights of these people are recognised and one at least out of the six appointments is considered to be listed and given to the people in the Provincial service either before or after they are promoted to the Imperial service. I based my motion for reduction on this one point, and I hope that at least one out of the six appointments will be listed and justice done to the Provincial officers in that department."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"I find it somewhat difficult to understand how this issue arises out of a proposal to reduce the grant for general direction. I shall not deal with the technical point however, but devote myself to the merits of the issue. I did deal with the merits fully on the 11th March last year. I pointed out then that the Provincial officers had had a new avenue of advancement opened to them, namely, by transfer on promotion to the Imperial service. I added that once in the Imperial service they were equally eligible with original recruits to that service for promotion to the administrative rank, that is to the post of Conservator. I also emphasized that promotion to the rank of Conservator was a matter of definite selection. And I went on to say that if one or other of these posts of Conservator were reserved for the Provincial Forest Service, the practical effect would be the appointment thereto of officers considered unfit for transfer to the Imperial Forest service, that is to say, officers who had been definitely refused promotion to the higher service for incompetence—I do not wish to lay stress on the word 'incompetence' in the way Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar has done; it is rather the absence of exceptional qualifications than the presence of exceptional disqualifications which I have in mind—or because they were quite junior officers and on that ground alone unfit to hold the post of Conservator.

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

I have before me here a tabular statement recently prepared by the Chief Conservator, which gives particulars of the period of service in district charge or administrative work of the five officers recently in the Provincial service but now in the Imperial service. I find that in the case of these officers the period of administrative work ranges from 11 to 13 years. On the other hand the senior permanent Conservator has had 26 years' administrative experience, and the junior acting Conservator has had 16 years of such experience. To put this in another way, I may point out that these gentlemen who by their merits have obtained promotion to the Imperial service must have been for a period of many years junior in the department to the officer who is now holding the post of junior Conservator. They were probably under his orders in various capacities. I notice further from particulars given of the grade in which these individual officers first entered the Forest department, that one began as a forester, two as deputy rangers, one as a temporary clerk and one as a probationary ranger. Now, I do not wish in any way to deprecate the merits of these officers. They have done good service, and they have earned the reward for good service. But it is plain that in respect of training as well as in respect of administrative experience they are definitely inferior to officers senior to them in the Imperial and Provincial forest services and cannot justly expect promotion—I am now dealing for the moment with those officers in the Provincial service who have recently been transferred to the Imperial service—promotion over the heads of officers who have hitherto been directly senior to them and in positions of authority over them, have had much longer administrative experience and have received much higher technical training. It is immaterial whether the training was in England or in India. The point is that their technical training is very different from any training given to a temporary clerk, a deputy ranger or a ranger. The training in the Forest colleges at Dehra Dun or Coimbatore is definitely inferior to the training given to the officers directly recruited for the Imperial Forest service. We have had for some time past under consideration the general question of the methods of training recruits for the Forest Department, whether in England or in India. But whatever changes may be made in the future, it is generally recognised that the present training of Provincial officers at Dehra Dun or Coimbatore is definitely inferior to the grade of training requisite for incumbents of Imperial posts.

“Now, I doubt if this motion has much, if any, reference to the case of officers who have actually been transferred from the Provincial service to the Imperial service. But with reference to

2 p.m. the remark that they have no prospect whatsoever of becoming Conservators, I may draw attention to the fact that three of them are 43 or under, and that it is quite possible if they continue to do as well in the future as apparently they have done in the past, that they will attain a stage of seniority which will make it necessary definitely to consider them for vacancies in the grade of Conservator.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“There are twelve younger men above them who want to retire to oblige the Provincial officers promoted to the Imperial service.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I think the hon. Member may be somewhat mistaken. It cannot be asserted confidently that these younger men will not retire before their full time.”

18th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ That is exactly what I say, and there cannot be anything extraordinary in their case.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ The rate of promotion in the Forest Department is now so rapid that conservatorships are not very far off even for quite junior officers. I am unable to say positively whether the rate of promotion will be accelerated or retarded in future, but in my judgment it is very likely to be accelerated. In my opinion therefore these officers—when I said they were now 42 or 43, I had in view the period of time stated by Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar—have a definite chance of becoming Conservators. So much for the officers who are in the Imperial service, having been transferred thereto from Provincial service.

“ The position of those who are in the Provincial service is infinitely weaker, for such officers all come under one or other of two disqualifications ; either, being at the top of their grade they have not been chosen for transfer to the Imperial Forest Service, because they have not been deemed worthy of selection, or they are officers with only seven, eight or nine years’ service who have not attained a degree of seniority justifying their transfer, and it cannot seriously be urged that their technical training or their administrative experience is such as to warrant their selection for the post of Conservator. Here I may say in conclusion that a conservatorship is not a mere post office—some people describe it as such—but if the developments of the Forest Department which I urged in my opening speech do take effect, the post of Conservator will become infinitely more important in the future. If gentlemen in this House had any detailed knowledge of the way in which, for instance, Mr. Tireman has interested himself in working out the details of the Chenat Nayar scheme, they would realize the very large responsibility that has fallen upon him. It is the duty of a Conservator to direct and control the exploitation of areas comprising hundreds of square miles. His responsibility is very great indeed. Only this morning the Chief Conservator told me that, so far from its being fair to say that in respect of such matters the Conservator was a post office, it was much nearer the truth so to describe the Chief Conservator himself. I mention this merely to emphasize what a very responsible post the post of Conservator is. At the present moment it would be in the highest degree inexpedient to post to such appointments officers who are definitely inferior in training and in administrative experience to those who stand above them on the list. I am not going to say anything about the merits of Mr. Raman Menon or Mr. Venkataramana Ayyar or any other individual officer in the Imperial or the Provincial service. Such personal references are most invidious.”

The House adjourned for lunch at 2-5 p.m. and re-assembled at 2-45 p.m.

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I am rising to a point of order, Sir. I want to draw attention to the fact that the discussion—the exact nature of which I was not aware of till the hon. Mover developed his speech—went on as if it related to the Conservators. The item of Rs. 1,02,200 relates only to the Chief Conservator and his personal assistant. Under the circumstances I do not wish to press this technical issue as the discussion is nearly over.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ The Leader of the House said that the discussion was over. There are a number of other people who

[Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar] [18th March 1922]

would like to speak on the point. As for the point of order, I was going on with my speech to criticize the policy of the Chief Conservator and to pass a vote of censure on this particular policy of his."

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“No hon. Member having risen to speak I now call upon Mr. C. V. Venkataramana Ayyangar to reply in case he wishes to do so.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I thank you, Sir. As I said I brought forward this motion only to show our dissatisfaction with the way in which the Chief Conservator has been doing things. Anyhow, Sir, as we expect a change in the member in charge of the department I hope that one of those present here will be in charge of it soon after the going away of our Leader of the House.

“I want to say only one thing. I am sorry to see that the whole speech of the Leader of the House has been following the principle of adding insult to injury. He not only stated that the department was not giving admission to Indians—by Indians I mean only people who have been recruited and trained in India and not people of white or brown colour who get training in England—he went further and stated that not one of these people was fit to be in the service.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I did not say anything of the sort.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“I was adding, Sir, ‘although’. Although he said that a few people who have been taken into the Imperial service now may by some chance come to the top, I want to show that to be absolutely impossible in practice. Because, now one man is on leave preparatory to retirement and another has gone to the Travancore State and yet curiously enough their places have not been filled up by the Provincial Government. Let us ignore the case of the man who has gone on leave preparatory to retirement. Let us take the case of Mr. Raman Menon and see whether there is any ghost of a chance for him to come up. He was born in 1873 nearly 50 years ago. With at least 14 people senior to him who are at least 10 to 15 years younger than himself, is it possible to suppose that all these people will be pleased to retire earlier in order to oblige Mr. Raman Menon? All that is impossible. You may put in any man in any place. It is not possible to expect any Extra Assistant Conservators who are placed in the Imperial service to go to the top at any time before he retires. Looking at it from any point of view, it is impossible, if the present rules are carried into effect, for any man trained in India and not having English training to get into a conservator’s place. Then it is said that he will get over many seniors. I do not want to mention names. We all know, Sir, that at least one Collector was brought into the Executive Council over the heads of various seniors including Members of the Board. When Judicial officers are promoted to the High Court the question of seniority or juniority does not come in their way at all. In the case of the Forest officers there is no question of one being under the other or over the other. Every senior is in charge of a major district, and by the mere chance of being recruited to the Imperial service one should not be considered to be more experienced than those who work in the Provincial service.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, it is not a mere chance. It is a definite selection.”

18th March 1922]

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“Definite selection, simply because he comes from Europe. If to-day there is held an examination between the Extra Assistant Conservators and Deputy Conservators, I bet, Sir, the prize will go to the former.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU:—“No betting is allowed in this House, Sir.” (Laughter.)

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“With all respect to the Chief Conservator although the department has got at its head an officer with a strong personality, it is very difficult for him to get rid of his environments. His environments are all European subordinates and his views are likely to be prejudiced by them. I have known him personally, and I can testify to the fact that he is a very sympathetic and amiable gentleman. But as in the case of the district collector and in the case of the district judge such things as listing some posts may occur in the Forest Department also. In this department where local knowledge is more necessary than in any other department it is very unfortunate that a man should be tabooed unless he goes to England and gets that celestial training in Forestry. Therefore I appeal to the present member and to his successor, whoever he may be, to change the present policy and to have one at least of the appointments as listed. With these few words I beg permission to withdraw my motion.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—“I wish first to say two things, Sir: One of them is that if this motion was intended to be a vote of censure on the policy followed by the Chief Conservator, the responsibility is not his. It lies upon His Excellency and myself who are answerable for the policy, and for the appointment of Conservators.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR:—“I have no objection to transfer it.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—“Secondly, Sir, I must say that I cannot undertake to leave on record for my successor, whoever he may be, any note contrary to the opinions I have expressed in this House.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 252.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo:—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

252. *To reduce the allotment of two lakhs for buildings by 1 lakh.*

“Sir, Rs. 2,56,000 has been spent on buildings during the current year while Rs. 2,40,000 was shown in the budget estimate of 1920-21. Every year we are thus having an expenditure of more than Rs. 2,00,000 for buildings under Forests. It may be that the Forest Department may prefer development in all directions, but the proportion of expenditure on buildings seems to be very high.

“Last year, when the hon. the Home Member replied to a similar motion of Mr. Siva Rao, he said he could not reduce anything for the reason that the provision was made for works at Mount Stuart, Dhone, and in connexion with the development of Russellkonda forests, for providing houses for the subordinate staff, and that attention to that matter could not be any longer

[Mr. Sasi Bhushana Rath]

[18th March 1922]

delayed. Last year that was the plea for obtaining sanction of Rs. 2,40,000, and I regret to see that Government have exceeded that by Rs. 16,000 during the current year. Now the hon. the Home Member comes forward with a demand of another Rs. 2,00,000. I think there is no necessity for this large expenditure on buildings. At least we could delay this expenditure for some time and spread the sum over a number of years, and I therefore propose a reduction of this expenditure by Rs. 1,00,000."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, I find it very difficult to deal with this series of proposals for reductions under this head. It would be much easier to handle a general proposition for a deduction from the aggregate grant for forests coupled with the clear understanding that the discretion where to apportion it rests with Government. The main difficulty about any such aggregate deduction is that it is exceedingly hard to distribute it in such a way as not to prejudice the receipt side of the budget, which has not come before this Council specifically for examination. Now, in this particular instance all I can say in regard to the allotment for buildings is that it is made up of a large number of detailed proposals, proposals which have been worked out and provide definitely for officers—rangers, foresters, guards—employed in particular forest areas, whom it is important to house in a manner which will save their health from unnecessary exposure to Malaria and other risks. I do not propose to expatiate in detail on the hygienic conditions required, but health is obviously dependent to a great extent upon adequate arrangements for water-supply, housing, etc. No medical man will gainsay that the surroundings of houses have much to do with the health of the officers who reside in them. Of course good housing is not an absolute preventive of malaria but it has a very definite bearing on the health of officers if they are decently housed."

"Now let me examine how this particular item stood as originally put forward by the Chief Conservator. The sum he asked for was Rs. 2,58,000, which he regarded as the absolute minimum in view of the extent to which the building programme had been stopped during the war. The Government cut down this figure by Rs. 58,000, and I am confident that further curtailment is out of the question. I would therefore advise the House to leave this item alone; if they really wish to press for a cut, let it be on the aggregate amount of the budget and not exceeding a reasonable figure—I say reasonable because the House must bear in mind that any large cut is bound to react very seriously on the receipt side."

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—"Last year, Sir, the hon. the Home Member did not give us any figures as to the need for new works, and the amount required for new works, for repairs, etc. In the absence of any definite idea as to how these monies are going to be spent under this head, it is rather hard for the House to accept the statement made by the hon. the Home Member."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Sir, may I rise at once to say that if the hon. Member would like to have details, I am prepared to give them?"

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—"If there is any detailed statement giving all the information available, I do not want to press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

18th March 1922]

Motion 253.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

253. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,74,500 for communications and buildings by Rs. 1,00,000.*

“I wish to be informed what these roads and bridges are intended for. We find that every year considerable sums are being spent for the construction of roads and bridges and of course upon buildings. The hon. the leader of the House has told us during the debate on the last motion that he is ready to give us the details. I wish to know similarly whether in connexion with communications and buildings, there are details, and whether these are quite essential. We spent Rs. 3,00,000 in 1920-21, and we have spent a similar amount during the current year and we propose to spend Rs. 2,59,500 for the next year. Another thing that I want to say is that the hon. the Leader of the House told us that he would rather prefer to have a general cutting of a certain percentage, and if he would tell us that it would not be less than $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent as was done in the case of grant No. I, I think, Sir, that would satisfy the House. So I wish to have some information on these two points.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, the statement which is in my hands gives the details in regard to roads and communications. The first and in some respects the most important item is that relating to roads and cart-tracks for exploitation of forests. The reason why these roads and cart-tracks are necessary is that felling operations are not confined to any particular area. According to the working plans, the whole forest area is divided into definite segments, and segment after segment is taken up for felling purposes. As this is done, it is necessary to extend the existing roads and make further roads and cart-tracks in order that the timber felled in such fresh areas may be brought to market. The next item is bridle and inspection paths, which also have to be extended as fresh areas are brought under management, as for instance in connexion with the large schemes in Tinnevelly, South Kanara and Malabar. Then there is the item of pending works or works in progress but not yet completed. Lastly, and this is an item which accounts for about half of the total estimate, there is the upkeep and repair of existing communications. Full details by circles and districts are given here in the statement under all these heads. As to the general necessity for roads and communications, take as an instance a proposal submitted and approved for the construction of a useful road—work in connexion with a particular tract of forest which is being brought under felling operations for the first time in the coming year. Without such a road the felled timber could not be brought to market, and a substantial item of receipt would be cut out. Thus, it would be false economy to restrict expenditure on that particular work.

“I turn now, Sir, to the general proposition which the House is apparently ready to accept, that is, a reduction of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent of the whole budget estimate under this head. I am willing to agree to that, if it is the general desire of the House, in order to cut short the rather wearisome discussions which otherwise we have before us, provided firstly that it is clearly understood that I cannot absolutely guarantee that the proposed cut of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent will not have some effect on the receipt side of the budget. I made

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

a similar cut at the instance of the Cabinet the other day, and we found it involved a substantial loss in receipts. It is necessary to examine the items very carefully in order to make certain that the loss in receipts does not exceed the saving in expenditure."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—“ May I know, Sir, if, when this $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent reduction is made, the Chenat Nayar scheme will be eliminated from this allotment ? ”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“ I was just coming to that and was about to point out that the $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent reduction could be accepted only with the further stipulation that it should be within the discretion of Government to effect the saving under such particular heads of expenditure as they thought fit. I certainly cannot make an exception in the case of the Chenat Nayar scheme, for I am persuaded that it is essential to go on with that scheme, as an integral part of the general programme of forest exploitation. I want to bring that matter to a definite issue and do not in the least wish to shirk or evade the issue. I would ask the Council as a whole whether it is not wiser to abide by the guidance of experts in such a matter. The Government of Madras are not acting merely on their own view of the case; it is not my personal opinion that is in issue. The developments of to-day in this direction are the result of work initiated more than two years ago during the time when His Excellency was in charge of the portfolio. They are the logical sequence of an order passed in 1919 laying down the general lines of the Chenat Nayar forest operations. We have taken the utmost pains to consult those who are most competent to advise on the matter and they are unanimous in their advice that the scheme is sound, and that it would be folly to abandon it. We have consulted the Inspector-General of Forests, and we have had the benefit of an important discussion on the whole question of forest utilization, which recently took place at Dehra Dun.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ If we are not going to decide on the Chenat Nayar scheme, I do not think we can come to any general agreement on this motion. I think that Sir Lionel Davidson agreed that that scheme could stand over. If that is not the case, I do not want that the House should come to any conclusion on this motion.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Order, order. The House cannot possibly come to any decision just now on what has been called the Chenat Nayar scheme. What we are now discussing is the motion to reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,74,500 for communications and buildings by Rs. 1,00,000. Whether the Chenat Nayar scheme is included in the sum of Rs. 4,74,500 or in the sum of Rs. 1,00,000; I do not know; but why I allowed the hon. the Home Member to speak was because the hon. Member has put forward the view that should the House insist upon a reduction, it would be more convenient to the department if some total reduction were agreed upon, the discretion being left to the Government to settle details instead of having a debate on each of the items. He deprecated the further discussion of this motion moved by Mr. Narasimhacharlu on the ground that it would be better to adopt the other course. So far as Mr. Ramalinga Chettiar is concerned, he has raised the issue that nothing that we may now decide

18th March 1922]

[The President]

upon this item on the agenda should dispose of what he calls the Chenat Nayar scheme. But that scheme is not on the agenda at all, so far as I can see."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" I do not wish, Sir, to mention the Chenat Nayar scheme any further, but I do want to safeguard myself against any idea that in accepting the suggestion of a $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent cut from the whole budget I am at the same time consenting to the elimination of an item which I regard as of extreme importance. I could not accept a $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent cut if it were coupled with the condition that that the scheme should be cut out."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—" In the light of what the hon. the Home Member has said, I do not wish to press my motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 254.

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—" Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

254. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,74,500 for communications and buildings by Rs. 100.*

" Sir, under this head of buildings and communications I was not able, when the detailed budget was placed in our hands, to understand how much of it was for original works and how much for repairs. Out of the original works, I know that some are of a very petty nature and some may be required in connexion with large forests where timber is to be felled and removed. I think the Government will be well advised to give those items separately and work out the schemes. Instead of throwing the whole burden on the revenues of a single year, they must raise a loan and run these concerns. The only point I want to urge is this, that when Government wish to have communications and buildings constructed in big forests where large revenue is expected, those schemes must not be run out of the ordinary revenues of the province but they must be met from loans. I have given notice of this motion in order to raise that point. If this list which the hon. Sir Lionel Davidson has referred to contains any such big items, it is a matter for consideration whether the Government will be well advised to set apart those items as loan items instead of meeting the expenditure out of the ordinary revenues."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—" As you have allowed this motion, Sir, and not ruled it out of order as covered by the previous motion, I am quite ready to answer at once and say that the advisability of debiting capital expenditure of this kind to loan funds has been considered and will be considered in future if the amounts in issue are sufficiently large. We examined the matter in some detail last June when His Excellency went up to Simla, and one of the questions which he was anxious to press or discuss at the time was the raising of a substantial development loan for Madras. The question whether that loan should include any large provision for capital outlay on the Forest department was considered at the time. I cannot say exactly what the conclusion arrived at was, but I think it was to the effect that the sum immediately in issue was not sufficiently large to justify recourse to borrowing. It was only a matter of 5, 6 or 7 lakhs, I forgot exactly how much, but I do know that the question of raising a loan

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

for communications and other capital outlay in regard to this particular Chenat Nayar scheme was examined and that the advice given was that it was possible to finance that scheme and most similar schemes out of the current profits derived each year. This may or may not be sound policy, and I am quite ready to re-examine the issue for future purposes."

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“It is a matter for the Finance Member to consider how these details are to be placed in the hands of the Council so as to enable the House to say which items can be met from the provincial funds and which items should be met from loans. If really an amount is intended for a continuous period or a particular programme having to be finished, certainly I do object to its being thrown on the provincial revenues. It is for the benefit of the generations to come and it is not just and reasonable that all the burden should be thrown upon the revenues of the province. If it is contemplated that this should be met from the provincial revenues, I should think the Council would have a serious objection. Now as the details are not before the House, I have no objection to withdraw.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 255.

The following motion was not made :—

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

255. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,10,000 for protection from fire by Rs. 50,000.*

Motion 256.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

256. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,17,000 for other works by Rs. 50,000.*

“Sir, I wish to make this motion only for the sake of obtaining information whether the expenditure proposed is proper. I wish to know, Sir, what the details of these ‘other works’ are.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I think, Sir, that exactly the same question was asked last year and the details of the ‘other works’ will be found at page 59 of the Forest Code. I beg to include items such as fencing, enclosing, pruning, lopping and girdling useless trees and cutting creepers, forming tanks and reservoirs for the convenience of cattle-grazing. They are operations which are necessary for the development of the forests and the provision made is considerably less than the actuals of 1920-21.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I do not press my motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 257 and 258.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

257. *To reduce the provision of Rs. 17,47,800 for conservancy and works by Rs. 1,00,000.*

18th March 1922]

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

258. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,47,800 for conservancy and works by Rs. 1,50,000.*

Motion 259.

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“ I make the following motion :—

259. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,47,800 for conservancy and works by Rs. 1,50,000.*

“ I may state at once that I have given notice of this motion to delete the provision made for working the Chenat Nayar forests. From the papers circulated to us it may be seen that we are going to commence in these forests a big scheme of exploitation and we are asked to invest a sum of over 24 lakhs to work this scheme in the next three or four years. Even this 24 lakhs is said by the Chief Conservator to be an under-estimate.

“ I believe we have a golden mine in the forests and that they have not been exploited to the best advantage hitherto. The income we were getting from the forests is very low when compared with the value of the investment. The hon. the Home Member has taken a period of 30 years and given the net income for the period and the result has not been sufficiently promising. I may say, Sir, that I am one of those that think that the Government have not done what they ought to have done. We had been thinking that we have been doing all that is possible with reference to these forests and many of us have been disappointed that the return is not as much as could be reasonably expected. The working of the Chenat Nayar scheme is a typical instance of the way in which things are done. Even a lay man like myself could see from the reports of the responsible officer circulated to us that up to this date this forest business has been a failure. There has been no return calculated for the huge property in the shape of the forest property and no calculations have been made of the cost of the permanent staff employed and no calculation of interest on the capital expenditure has been made. Again, Sir, it is stated that timber worth about Rs. 36,000 is remaining idle on the site. In spite of all these it is said that there is a loss of over Rs. 4,000 in the working of these forests up to date. And then with regard to the future, the admissions that have been made by the conservators of the forests in the reports show that we cannot expect even the future to be in any way different from the past. We also learn that even a contour map is not available. Of course forests in India are very different from those in other countries. No enumeration survey has been made and we have no information as to the quantity and quality of timber available. It is also said that there is no market at present for many of the timber. So, Sir, in this position we are asked to give a large sum of money for investment in this scheme. Without having any of these necessary details if we commit our country to this huge sum what would be said of us? We are more or less trustees and we must be careful how we utilize the funds at our disposal. If further enquiries are made on all these lines and a market is found for the timber available, if after all these things are done, and if with those data the Government will

[Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar] [18th March 1922]

ask us for funds we can be in a better position to give. Till then as trustees of the public funds we shall not be properly discharging our duties if we commit ourselves, the country and the future generations in this manner.

“ Well, Sir, from the figures that are given at page 27, it could be seen what actual expenditure was incurred and how much we 3-30 p.m. would lose by not continuing the scheme. Of course you cannot expect any saving from what is shown as ordinary expenditure as it is already spent.

The capital expenditure consists of—

purchase of 112 buffaloes,
purchase of stores, tools and plant,
construction of Olavakode-Dhoni road,
construction of road to Sappal camp,
construction of footpaths,
construction of dragpaths and slides,
clearing depot site at Dhoni,
construction of buildings,
water-supply,
pay and travelling allowances of special establishment, and
surveys, enumeration surveys and miscellaneous.

“ These are the items, Sir, of capital expenditure which it is said we will lose if we do not continue the work. With regard to these items, a further question arises, namely that of utilizing such of those things as can be so utilized elsewhere. As regards the buffaloes, they can be used in the Nilambur and Mount Stuart forests all close by, so that there will be no loss under this head. With regard to stores, tools and plant, they also can be utilized in other forests without any loss as will be agreed by all of us. Then there are the Olavakode-Dhoni road and the other road to Sappal camp which we will have to leave.

“ With regard to the footpaths and dragpaths, I beg to submit that the classification is not clear. Footpaths can only serve a limited area and with reference to the other areas they cannot be of any use whatsoever, and when we go back to use the same plot of land 50 or 60 years afterwards we will have to remake them. It is only when we work particular plots these footpaths will be required and once those plots are worked up they go out of use. So there is no loss at all under this item.

“ With regard to buildings and the site, we will not have to lose anything as the price of buildings and site is said to be increasing day by day at Olavakode. What I say is that if the Government after making further investigations and collecting all the data necessary are satisfied and the Council is also convinced that it is going to be a profitable concern, I shall be glad to support the commencement of the whole scheme again.

“ With regard to the last item, i.e., pay and travelling allowance of special establishment, I cannot really understand how it can be brought under capital expenditure. It ought to be ordinary expenditure and so there will be no loss under this head by giving up the scheme. After all, our loss under these heads will be about Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000, even if it is a question of permanently giving up the scheme. As I said, we have not yet

18th March 1922] [Mr. T. A. Ramalinga Chettiar]

decided once for all as to what we should do. So, the loss will not be even so much as that. Even if it comes to Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000, I think it is better to lose Rs. 50,000 or Rs. 60,000 than committing ourselves to a huge expenditure of about 24 or 25 lakhs of rupees and afterwards find ourselves mistaken. For these reasons, I move for the reduction of the allotment and request the Council to accept it."

Rao Bahadur T. NAMBERUMAL CHETTIYAR :—“ Much has been said about the Chenat Nayar scheme having been a failure. On the other hand, I would say that with the figures before us, I can convince the House that it was a profitable venture and not one which was not attended with success. For, what any businessman would do under the circumstances has been done in this case, and a portion of the expenditure which ought to have been debited to capital account has been debited to Revenue, and hence there is a loss of Rs. 4,108 as shown at page 28 of the circular on forest exploitation. A sum of Rs. 8,000 which was the expenditure incurred under freight has been debited to Revenue, which I think ought to go to the capital account. Any businessman would try to advertise as best as he can his wares and try also to get a good bidder. In this case as a sort of advertisement timber has been sent from Olavakode to Kolar Gold Fields at the expense of the Forest department, only to induce purchasers there to make a contract for purchase of the output. Such expenditure should not be debited as expenditure during the year, but should be carried to the capital account to be annually written off under depreciation. If this view, that I suggest, is accepted, the income would have been Rs. 4,000 or more, and there would not have been a loss as is shown in that circular.

“ Another point has been mentioned by the mover that the value of the timber at the site which is not sold has been taken into account as Rs. 32,000 or so, and that this stock which is on hand, he was afraid, may or may not fetch the price fixed, and that it is likely to end in a loss. Any businessman would take into account the value of the stock on hand to ascertain the result of his venture. In this case, actual cost was taken; and who knows the stock on hand would not fetch more. This venture is the first of its kind, and if I mention other ventures of the same nature elsewhere I am sure he will withdraw the motion and recommend further expenditure on ventures of this sort. For instance, Sir, the net income of the Cochin Government prior to the forest tramway was not more than Rs. 6,000 per annum. After the introduction of the tramway, and after the virgin forests were tapped, the net income was Rs. 3 lakhs or so. Sir, you will thus see the difference between the net income prior to the introduction of facilities for bringing forest produce into the market, and the net income when these facilities were obtainable as one is to fifty. The forest revenue has since been better year after year, and that ought to convince us to push on further ventures of this kind. The mover has spoken of certain timbers which may or may not find a market. All I can say is that with modern facilities and modern appliances, even inferior timber could be turned to profitable account. Sleepers creosoted, so to say, even from inferior timber will be accepted by Railway companies; and therefore an attempt should be made in that direction to get the proper plant. Last year, Sir, we lost something like Rs. 30 lakhs by the timber being purchased elsewhere. This year, i.e., in February 1922, the Railway administration in Southern India has called for tenders for about 280,000 sleepers of which 230,000 or so were thrown open

[Mr. T. Namberumal Chettiar] [18th March 1922]

to the markets of Australia. The value of the sweepers shut out is something like Rs. 30 or 35 lakhs. Such an amount is going out of the country. If our forests are developed, I am sure all that money will be in the country. I would therefore not grudge any expenditure on forest exploitation and not leave the virgin forests untapped for want of funds.

The hon. Mover has spoken about Rs. 24 lakhs as the sum required, and said that we should consider well before any further venture is made. We are not asked for Rs. 24 lakhs now and this does not form a portion of the budget. The mover suggests that Chenat Nayar forest scheme may be abandoned, and also suggests ways and means of utilizing the buildings already put up. These suggestions, if adopted, will certainly result in a loss. To stop the working is a retrograde step and ought not to be allowed. Capital expenditure has already been incurred and no further expenditure would be required. I will therefore suggest that the scheme should not be abandoned; and I assure the House that, if continued, it will add to the revenue."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“We have just had an exposition of some of the business aspects of this project from the hon. Member Mr. Namberumal Chetti whose competence to advise on such aspects will I imagine be generally admitted in this House. Mr. Ramalinga Chettiar has favoured us with a detailed examination of the scheme, covering very much the same ground as the note which he put into the Finance Committee the other day. That note has been examined by the Chief Conservator, who has furnished me with valuable criticisms, which I propose at least in part to utilize. In some respects I find that Mr. Ramalinga Chettiar is in error in his statements of fact. I do not blame him for this as it is possible that incorrect information was supplied to him. There is however certainly a mistake in the statement that there is no satisfactory topographical map in existence. There is an excellent topographical map in existence.”

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—“I may state that all these statements that I have made are made on the basis of the reports of Mr. Cox and Mr. Martin and I have introduced not a single word or sentence of my own.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“I expressly stated, Sir, that the information supplied to him may not have been correct. I am now supplying correct information on this particular point. There is in fact a good topographical map.

“Then criticism was directed to the supposed absence of stock-maps and forest enumeration. But as a matter of fact, the whole area in the Dhoni valley has been mapped and enumerated and we do possess an exact knowledge of the timber to be obtained, that is to say a reasonably exact knowledge. The work had not been completed when Mr. Cox was interviewed by the Members of the Finance Committee. But it has since been completed. Surely, Sir, there are technical matters which Mr. Ramalinga Chettiar and other laymen might well leave to the judgment of trained forest officers or persons whose technical knowledge enables them to express a decided and trustworthy opinion whether certain projects are practicable or not. We are not relying only on the opinions of our own forest officers. We have had the merits of the scheme laid in detail before the Inspector-General of Forests for all India, Mr. Clutterbuck. I am not going to attempt to go into the details

18th March 1922]

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

at all. But this, I will say, that with all the facts before him, Mr. Clutterbuck, the Inspector-General of Forests and Chief Adviser to the Government of India on all forest matters, has recommended the developments which we are now pushing. I think, Sir, that ought to be good enough for this House to go on.

"There are one or two minor points of detail which Mr. Ramalinga Chettiyar has touched. He has told us that it will be practically impossible to bring timber from one side of the ridge to another except at prohibitive cost."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"I did not say anything like that."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—"Well, Sir, the statement has been repeated whoever may be responsible for it. It is exactly for that class of operations the services of highly skilled forest engineers are required. Most of us, or many of us, in this House were present the other day at the cinema exhibition which was held for the express purpose of showing how difficult operations of that kind can be carried out with the aid of the proper appliances. I am not absolutely certain in my recollection, but I believe that this particular problem was dealt with in one of the films exhibited.

"My hon. Colleague, Sir Charles Todhunter, reminds me that the actual picture exhibited a donkey engine close to the top of a ridge with a wire rope reaching down to the bottom of the valley on the other side. Practical engineering experience of this kind is exactly not to be found anywhere in India now and it is exactly that difficulty which makes me press so strongly for the engagement of an expert like Mr. Martin who can keep us from errors and mistakes and who will tell us how works of this kind are to be carried out without loss.

"There has been a good deal of general criticism on the question whether or not the first eighteen months' working, the Chenat Nayar scheme, as it is called, has resulted in a profit or loss. I am not going to lay down any dogmatic proposition on the subject for whether there has actually been loss or profit during the past eighteen months or two years, I take my stand on the broad proposition that big ventures of this description are not to be judged merely by the figures of the first year or two. If gentlemen who are competent to examine the working of such schemes are satisfied that notwithstanding possible loss during the first year or two valuable experience has been gained and that there are substantial reasons for going on, I look on that as sufficient guarantee against loss in the future. Without doubt valuable experience has been gained during the past year in so far as the scheme has demonstrated the possibility of extracting timber from areas previously supposed to be inaccessible. We have been asked why should not this unprofitable scheme be turned down and the problem of exploiting forest resources on modern lines be transferred to other areas. My answer to that, Sir, is that on a consideration of the forest areas of the whole of the Presidency the Chief Conservator came to the conclusion—and I have no doubt he was quite right—that by far the best place for beginning experimental work of this kind was in the neighbourhood of Chenat Nayar. There are no ever-green forests in the Presidency so well provided with access to the railway and the

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

markets as this place, which is quite close to Olavakode—a large timber market and a railway town. We have sufficiently accurate information about the forests and we are now felling a large variety of timbers for which we are likely to get a firm demand from the Kolar Gold Fields. We know also that since these operations began the possibilities of market developments have very much increased. We know, that there are methods of seasoning the soft woods and the experiments made under that head have so far been exceedingly favourable. We know that timbers taken out from these areas are regarded with the highest favour in England. We know—I do not want to attach any particular importance to English opinion on the matter, but it is the case—that there is a very large demand, a growing demand for timber from England. A representative of Messrs. Howard & Co., who are timber agents of the Government of India and the Secretary of State, has been in Southern India during the past few weeks and I may tell the House that the figures he mentioned in regard to the immediate demand for timber in England run into thousands of tons. All our expert advice is in the direction of the conclusion that whatever is taken out of these forests will be saleable at a profit on the whole transaction sooner or later. I have said, Sir, that the Chenat Nayer forests are well adapted to this class of experiment. If the initial operations have not been clearly profitable, that is due mainly to the fact that we have not had the expert advice which we hope to obtain in the future. It would be quite easy, if I had time to touch on the details of the scheme, to point out, as Mr. Cox, in one of the papers communicated to the hon. Members of this House, has done, the various respects in which the initial operations were defective. Broadly speaking there was not a sufficiency of supervision and control over the subordinates employed on the spot. If it is said that these operations should now be stopped, the machinery, the live stock and everything transferred to other areas, I reply in the first instance that there are no other equally suitable areas. With regard to the proposal to sell or scrap the buildings my answer is that the staff buildings in the heart of the forest are quite unsaleable and would be useless if the operations were closed down. Lastly, I may say that if this considered scheme of expenditure be cut out, there will be a corresponding reduction of at least Rs. 75,000 on the receipt side, being the profits anticipated from the venture."

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—“Sir, I propose, with your permission, to ask the hon. the Home Member if he would, in view of certain uncertainties which appear from the reports which have been submitted to us and which I will presently point out, give an undertaking that, if this item which appears in connexion with the Chenat Nayar forest scheme in the budget for the next year is allowed, the Government will not commit themselves to any expenditure or contract in respect of purchase of machinery until the House has had an opportunity of discussing the matter in full or until both the Forest Advisory Committee and the Finance Committee have had an opportunity of going into it. My reasons are these. At page 22 of the book which has been circulated to us it is said that Mr. Tireman's proposals involve an expenditure spread over three years of Rs. 24,44,400 and by the exploitation and sale of timber during that period a profit of 16 lakhs. At page 21 of the same book it is stated ‘Still less can we form an accurate idea of profits to be realized if and when the various subsidiary works connected with the exploitation of the forests are in use.’ Again at page 18 we find: ‘Whether the estimates include

18th March 1922] [Mr. O. Tanikachala Chettiar]

freight, insurance, customs, carriage and erection is not stated.' The calculations that have been made and presented in this book are those of Mr. Martin and of Mr. Tireman without our knowing whether the prices which are given there include freight, insurance, customs, carriage and erection. In the case of machinery, incidentally it is said, ordered in England for the Russellkonda saw mill the estimates were exceeded by about 100 per cent due to increase of freight 4 per cent, increase of manufacture cost 55 per cent and in the rate of exchange 41 per cent. So that, after the fate that has befallen the Russellkonda saw mill machinery, if we consent to the purchase of machinery under this scheme, it may be that we and our successors would be committing ourselves to an expenditure of 50 lakhs of rupees. There is a good deal of uncertainty about this. Mr. Tireman has made calculations as to how these things are to be done at page 19 of the book. He proposes to erect a saw mill at a cost of 3 lakhs and erect a seasoning plant at a cost of 4 lakhs. No doubt this is an estimate, but what knowledge he possesses of the cost is not known. 'Mr. Tireman's estimate,' it is stated at page 19, 'for a saw mill is presumably based on the cost of that now under erection at Russellkonda. It is probable that for an expenditure of 3 lakhs a larger and more fully-equipped mill than the Russellkonda mill could be provided.' With regard to the seasoning plant that is proposed to season thick sleepers with the aid of certain chemicals, rendering them fit for use as sleepers, there is at present no reliable information as to the type of plant, as to its purpose or its cost. We are merely told that one plant will cost 3 lakhs and another 4 lakhs. In this way we are told that the total cost would come to 24 lakhs and judging, as I said, by Russellkonda it may be 48 lakhs. No doubt the one and a half lakhs provided for this year can be granted. But the apprehension of several sections of this House is that as in the case of the Russellkonda scheme where a contract was entered into before ever the scheme was placed before the Council for the sanction of the required amount when it was found that it was too late for us, however willing, to undo the thing, in this case also we do not want, by reason of finding this sum of one and a half lakhs which is part of a scheme costing 24 lakhs, by implication, commit ourselves to the whole of this Chennat Nayar scheme. Of the machinery and other things required, as to the value and utility of it there seems to be no correct information and the Government can very well say if the estimates exceeded that they could not be blamed. We are anxious, therefore, that while some concession may be made by the House, at the same time in the name of the sanction that is impliedly granted to the one and a half lakhs for this year we shall not be said to have committed ourselves to the entire cost thereof until more information is forthcoming. I do not say that the scheme will not be successful, but all that I say is, there is a good deal of room for investigation, for more information, and until all that has been ascertained and placed before this House and considered by it, no final decision must be come to either by Government or by its officers. In these circumstances, I request the hon. the Home Member to tell us whether he is prepared to say that no contracts will be entered into without the sanction of the House or until the whole of this thing shall be fully considered by this House and I trust that it is a reasonable request."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—Sir, I should like to know what exactly Mr. Tanikachala Chettiar means by contracts, but before I ask him that specific question, I am quite ready to go a very long way to

[Sir Lionel Davidson]

[18th March 1922]

meet him in this matter. I may say, as a matter of fact, that the reduction in the Chenat Nair scheme as compared with the figures originally put forward is based on the need for caution, because we felt as Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar feels, that there was need for further investigation. The Chenat Nayar scheme as it is put down in this budget is not identical with the much larger proposals which we hope to work out under the guidance of Mr. Martin. The provision that is made this year, Sir, is a logical consequence of the administrative approval given to the work in the Chenat Nayar forests in November 1919. It is not what is sometimes loosely called Mr. Martin's scheme. We originally proposed the purchase of stores, tools and plants, such as additional tractors, waggons, oil tanks, fuel and other items, but since this year's budget came in we have eliminated practically all such items. All these go out because we wish to have Mr. Martin's advice as to what exactly we should get and when, because we felt with the hon. Member, Mr. Tanikachala Chettiyar, that further investigation, further examination was desirable. We cannot carry out that further examination or investigation or frame proposals unless this House will agree to secure for us expert advice in the affair. The final scheme will in the ordinary course under the rules of this Government and the Council come before the Forest Advisory Committee and the Finance Committee.

"In the meantime all that I ask is that we should continue expenditure on present lines in general and without any large development. Sir, it was made a matter of criticism last year and it has been repeated to-day that contracts were entered into in the case of the Russellkonda saw mill without consultation with the Council. My answer is, so far as that is concerned, that the arrangements were entered into before this House came into being. I do not want to revive or refer to that *infandum dolorem*. It is an oft-told tale which I do not want to repeat. But it is because of that very issue as raised in the case of the Russellkonda saw mill that I come before this House to-day and say that I must have an expert adviser to work out the details of schemes which we are confident will be to the very great advantage of the Presidency of Madras and the ryots who pay the taxes of the Presidency. We must have an expert on whom we can rely for this purpose. If we do not get such a man then I, for one, shall advise the complete shutting down of all development operations, because what little experience we have gained shows that highly trained advice is necessary to bring such experiments to a successful conclusion. To return to the invitation addressed to me, I am quite ready to undertake that no large development shall take place without being brought forward before the Forest Advisory Committee and the Finance Committee. But I do ask, and ask with all the insistence in my power, that we should be allowed to have an adviser who can give us advice which we shall feel justified in accepting."

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—"Sir, on the assurance given by the hon. the Home Member, I request permission 4 p.m. to withdraw this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—"Before proceeding further I would remind the House that the period of half a day, or three hours, allowed for this demand will expire at half past four and at half past four all other motions will automatically lapse, and I shall have to put the demand to the House."

18th March 1922]

Motions 260 to 264.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI:—

260. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,47,800 for conservancy and works by Rs. 2 lakhs.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR:—

261. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 17,47,800 for conservancy and works by Rs. 2,00,000.*

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—

262. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 18,28,500 for conservancy and works (including Agency) by Rs. 100.*

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—

263. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,67,000 for extra assistant conservators by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—

264. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 15,600 for five supernumerary extra assistant conservators.*

Motion 265.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion:—

265. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for duty allowance for extra assistant conservators in major charge districts.*

"The reason is the same as was advanced in the case of duty allowance in other departments and I do not want to repeat the same. When this House is committed to a policy of reducing duty allowances, it should be done in this case also."

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON:—"The duty allowances provided in this case, Sir, are part of the scale of remuneration sanctioned by the Government of India and the Secretary of State on the recommendation of the Public Service Commission, and I believe that whereas formerly there were only one or two such allowances, there is a proposal to increase their number. I cannot lay my hands on chapter and verse for that proposition, but I believe it to be a generally admitted fact. If these allowances be removed, I need hardly say that their withdrawal would cause justifiable discontent on the part of the incumbents who have been in receipt of the allowance for some time past. And much as I wish to avoid wasting the time of the Council, I am afraid I shall have again to impose the responsibility for this on those who vote for the motion."

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA:—"In the light of the information that has been given by the hon. the Home Member, I do not want to press this motion."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 266 to 275.

The following motions were not made:—

Mr. M. NARAYANASWAMI REDDI:—

266. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for duty allowance for extra assistant conservators in major charge districts.*

[18th March 1922

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

267. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,000 for duty allowance for extra assistant conservators in major charge districts.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasay :—

268. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for one inspector of live-stock.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

269. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,200 for local allowance for forest research officer.

Mr. M. APPALANARASAYYA NAYUDU :—

270. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 16,69,730 for salaries by Rs. 1,00,000.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

271. To omit the allotment of Rs. 10,800 for supernumerary rangers.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

272. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 20,200 for vernacular training school by Rs. 12,000.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

273. To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,500 for cost of training probationers in Dehra Dun College.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

274. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,344, cost of 48 hands in attenders, duffadars, peons in conservators' establishment by cost of 16 hands.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

275. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 1,32,030, cost of 256 hands of temporary clerks and servants provided for under district forest office establishment by cost of 164 hands.

Motion 276.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“Sir, I beg to move the following :—

276. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,45,780 for forest establishment by 1.50 lakhs.

“In view of the discussion we have had on the previous motions, I think it is desirable that out of a large scheme provided for expenditure under establishment, a total sum of $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs should be omitted, leaving it to the member in charge to effect that reduction under any item. I do not think it is necessary to say anything more at present, because we are doing this with the object of saving as much money as possible and of lessening the burden on the tax-payer.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, I am sorry to say that I cannot accept Mr. Krishna Rao's motion for a reduction of $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs under establishment as it is more than the 1.06 lakhs which I agreed to. Also in reducing that amount, I really must ask the House to give me entire discretion as to how to effect that reduction. I cannot agree to a reduction of $1\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs or to its being taken off the establishment charges.”

18th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I don’t press my motion, Sir.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

—Motions 277 to 294.

• The following motions were not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

277. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 15,45,780 for forest establishment by Rs. 60,000.*

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

278. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 45,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

279. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4.50 lakhs for travelling allowance by Rs. 45,000.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

280. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 45,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

281. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 45,000.*

Mr. R. SEINIVASA AYYANGAR :—

282. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 50,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

283. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 45,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

284. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,50,000 for travelling allowance by Rs. 45,000.”*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

285. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for supervision staff for forest panchayat.*

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—

286. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 30,000 for supervision staff for forest panchayat.*

Rao Bahadur T. BALAJI RAO NAYUDU :—

287. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 74,781.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

288. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

[18th March 1922]

Mr. C. NATESA MUDALIYAR :—

289. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.”*

Rao Bahadur T. A. RAMALINGA CHETTIYAR :—

290. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

291. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

292. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

293. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,46,740 for forest establishments by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

294. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42.52 lakhs for Forest by Rs. 50,000.”*

Motion 295.

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—“Mr. President, I beg to make the following motion:—

295. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 42.52 lakhs for Forest by Rs. 10 lakhs.*

“The Forest department has been running on as a losing concern last year and in view of our present financial stringency, I hope the House will accept my motion for the reduction.”

The hon. Sir LIONEL DAVIDSON :—“Sir, after what I have already said, it is obvious that I could not possibly agree to a reduction of 10 lakhs, but I did undertake to effect a reduction of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent. If this motion is converted into that, I think it will come to a cut of about Re. 1,06,300. But I should like to have it made clear whether this one lakh and odd includes the personal Assistant's duty allowance or not, because if that be excluded, the amount of Rs. 1,06,300 would have to be reduced by Rs. 2,400.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I had better explain the situation. The House has already passed a reduction of Rs. 2,400 on account of duty allowance to the personal assistant; that is the only reduction that has so far been made. Now, if this reduction of $2\frac{1}{2}$ per cent, or 1.06 lakhs, is made, this will also be a resolution of the House. But the other amount will be included in this. If the Government want to carry out both the resolutions, they cannot very well restore the item of Rs. 2,400 and deduct the amount under some other head. That is the point. The reduction of Rs. 2,400 having already been made, it comes to this, that the difference between Rs. 1.06 lakhs and Rs. 2,400 must be found from such other items as the Government may lay their hands upon. If it is the wish of the House to reduce the demand by Rs. 1.06 lakhs, somebody will have to get up and move formally an amendment to that effect.”

18th March 1922]

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“With your permission, Sir, I beg to move that Rs. 1·06 lakhs be substituted for the 10 lakhs.”

Mr. V. P. PAKKIRISWAMI PILLAI :—“I agree to the amendment, Sir.”

The amendment was then put and carried.

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“The motion as amended will stand as follows :—

To reduce the allotment of 42·52 lakhs for Forest by 1·06 lakhs.”

The motion as amended was then put and carried.

Motion 296.

The following motion was not made :—

Dr. P. SUBBARAYAN :—

296. *To reduce the allotment of 42·52 lakhs for Forest by Rs. 100.*

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding 42·52 lakhs minus 1·06 lakhs under Demand IV—Forest was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND V—REGISTRATION.

4-15 p.m.

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I beg to move Demand V—Registration for a sum of Rs. 23·02 lakhs.”

Motion 297.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

297. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.*

Motion 298.

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—“I beg to make the following motion :—

298. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.”*

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“This question whether we should dispense with the inspector of registration is under examination. I am investigating it and it is not yet complete. After receiving full information if it is found that he is not necessary, I will give effect to it.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 299 to 306.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

299. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.*

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

300. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.*

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—

301. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.*

[18th March 1922]

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

302. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

303. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 3,900 for inspector of registration offices.*

Mr. T. C. TANGAVELU PILLAI :—

304. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration.*

Rao Bahadur K. GOPALAKRISHNAYYA :—

305. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Personal Assistant to the Inspector-General of Registration.*

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

306. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,800 for duty allowance of personal assistant and inspector of registration offices.***Motion 307.**

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

307. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,800 for duty allowance of personal assistant and inspector of registration offices.*

“The principle has been accepted by this House already and I formally make the motion.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“If in every other department, Sir, the Government cancels the duty allowance, the Registration department also will follow suit. If it is not cancelled in the other departments, it will stand here also.”

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“I believe this is a matter on which the decision of the House will have to prevail. I request the Minister to consider the matter and honour the House. The question of principle has been discussed at great length and I hope the Council will carry this motion.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“If the House passes a motion that the duty allowance should be taken away, we are bound to obey.”

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“In such matters we expect the hon. the Minister to give us the lead. It is for the Ministers to give the lead and set an example. Therefore we expect the hon. the Minister for Excise to come forward and say that he will cancel the duty allowance.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I have already stated that I am bound to follow the decision of the House.”

The motion was put and carried and the reduction was made.

Motions 308 to 312.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—

308. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,800 for duty allowance of personal assistant and inspector of registration offices.*

18th March 1922]

Rao Sahib U. RAMA RAO :—

309. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,800 for duty allowance of personal assistant and inspector of registration offices.

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

310. To omit the allotment of Rs. 1,800 for duty allowance of personal assistant and inspector of registration offices.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—

311. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 71,053 for registration salaries and establishments by Rs. 7,000.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

312. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 71,053 for registration salaries and establishment by Rs. 100.

Motion 313.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

313. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,41,180 for sub-registrars by Rs. 30,000.

“It is printed as 3 lakhs. It is a mistake.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“I fear it is the hon. Member's mistake.”

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“It is a mistake in my typed copy. Now we have a number of joint sub-registrars for each district. The system is really erroneous. The joint sub-registrar is practically in charge of the district registrar's office, but has no disciplinary powers over the district establishment. It is found to be satisfactory neither to the district registrar nor to the joint district registrar. I think the system of joint sub-registrars may be done away with and the system of registrars being placed in charge of the district headquarters reintroduced. One of the senior sub-registrars may be put in charge of the office and his post may be filled by a junior. If we do that there will be considerable economy effected.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“The system that was proposed and which is referred to by my hon. friend was tried and found to be very defective. When you, Sir, were in charge of this department, you reorganized the whole thing and found that that system was not satisfactory and therefore the present system was introduced. The fact is that the district registrars have got inspection work also. They have to do the inspection of the sub-offices and during that time it is not possible to hand over charge to some head clerk or some probationary junior. That led to grave irregularities in many places. Therefore a responsible officer has to be placed in charge when the district registrar is absent. That is the reason why we have joint registrars. It is absolutely necessary to have them and I appeal to my friend Mr. Munshi Muhammad Abdur Rahman who nods assent.”

Munshi MUHAMMAD ABDUR RAHMAN SAHIB Bahadur :—“It is necessary that joint district registrars should be in charge of offices.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[18th March 1922

Motions 314 and 315.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. T. ARUMAINATHA PILLAI :—

314. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 900 for duty allowance to the Registrar, Madras-Chingleput.*

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

315. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 900 for duty allowance to the Registrar, Madras-Chingleput.*

Motion 316.

Mr. C. RAMALINGA REDDI :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

316. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 900 for duty allowance to the Registrar, Madras-Chingleput.*

“ I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Minister to the strong feeling in the House. If he will give an assurance that he will carry out the intentions expressed by the House I shall be glad.”

The hon. Rao Bahadar A. P. PATRO :—“ It is my duty to carry out the wish of the House.”

The hon. the PRESIDENT :—“ Then I will put the motion formally to vote.”

The motion was put and carried unanimously and the reduction was made.

Motion 317.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. O. TANIKACHALA CHETTIYAR :—

317. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 900 for duty allowance to the Registrar, Madras-Chingleput.*

Motion 318.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

318. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 22,41,611 by Rs. 100.*

“ I only want to bring to the notice of the hon. the Minister that there are a large number of joint sub-registrars who are appointed for the purpose of assisting the district registrars.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“ Probably the hon. Member was not in his seat when I explained the same matter.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 319.

The following motion was not made :—

Mr. B. MUNISWAMI NAYUDU :—

319. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,04,164 for Registration by Rs. 10,000.*

Motion 320.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

320. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,04,164 for Registration by Rs. 100.*

18th March 1922] [Mr. A. Ranganatha Mudaliyar]

“Just as in the Revenue department, it is possible in the Registration department also to re-organize district charges. The lighter charges of Gôdâvari, Guntûr, Kurnool, Bellary and Anantapur may be re-organized. I think it is a point worthy of consideration by the Minister. We used to have one district registrar in charge of more than one district before. Probably in the case of these lighter charges the old system might be reverted to. Inasmuch as you are keeping the joint registrars my proposal may be viewed favourably. There is the question of the inspector of registration offices. There is also the question of travelling allowance. These people are getting travelling allowance at rather very high rates. That is again a point which he might enquire into. For these reasons I have put this motion for consideration.”

The hon. Rao Bahadur A. P. PATRO :—“I shall certainly consider the points suggested by the hon. Member.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 321 and 322.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

321. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23,04,164 for Registration by Rs. 100.*

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU :—

322. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 23.01 lakhs under Registration by Rs. 100.*

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rs. 23.01 lakhs minus Rs. 2,700 under Demand V—Registration was put and carried.

The grant was made.

DEMAND VI—IRRIGATION.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“Sir, I beg to move Demand VI relating to irrigation and amounting to 60.72 lakhs. The details of that amount are to be found in the same document. I have already expressed to the House my feelings of regret at the reduced allotment which I have been able to secure in the matter of irrigation. I also explained the unavoidable circumstances which led to this unfortunate result. I should have very much wished to have obtained from the Finance Department as much money as would have enabled me to carry on some of my ambitious schemes but this was financially impossible.

“The House is fully aware that the financial condition of the province is far from satisfactory. This is the only grant, Sir, which the

4-30 p.m. Legislative Assembly passed without a dissentient voice. The Finance Leader, as he is called, I suppose, of the democratic party in the Legislative Assembly, our friend Mr. Rangachariyar, urged upon the House the desirability of passing the whole demand under irrigation without the reduction of a single pie, as he rightly called expenditure on irrigation ‘a national asset’ (hear, hear); and I hope this House will also pass this grant intact and thus enable me to spend an already reduced allotment at least in the course of the next year for the development of irrigation.”

[18th March 1922

Motion 323.

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

323. *To omit the allotment of Rs. 23,760 for 11 supervisors.*

“It is said that under this head, irrigation, which is a capital expenditure, we should not cut down any amount, as has also been well advised by the hon. the Revenue Member. But I see a lot of money is not at all going towards the capital expenditure but is wasted under the establishment. This is not in proportion to the capital expenditure that we are going to put in for the year. It is proposed, therefore, that these 11 supervisors are not necessary for this department. The sub-overseers and others are quite enough for the purpose.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH Sahib Bahadur :—“Sir, I may assure the hon. mover who has brought forward this motion that this question is engaging my attention already. I am aware that there are sub-overseers, overseers and supervisors employed in the minor irrigation department and while looking through the old correspondence which led to the creation of the office of supervisors, I was able to trace them back to the year 1914, when on the recommendation of the Board of Revenue it was decided to appoint one supervisor in areas where there were five or six sub-overseers at work. Ever since then, the supervisors have been in existence; but we are now in communication with the Collectors of the districts, who of course control all minor irrigation works, as regards the necessity of continuing these officers and whether sub-overseers or overseers would not suffice. The question is, I believe, nearly investigated and will soon be in the hands of the Government. After complete report from the Collectors and the Board of Revenue has been made thereon, I shall pass necessary orders and I shall certainly bear in mind the suggestion of the hon. Mover.”

Sriman SASI BHUSHANA RATH Mahasayo :—“I do not press the motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 324.

Mr C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

324. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,21,826 for establishment by Rs. 100.*

“I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Revenue Member to the very glaring fact that we have got plenty of establishments but no money for any work. The original works come to only Rs. 10,000; repairs and maintenance, 5 lakhs; establishment, nearly $2\frac{1}{4}$ lakhs. Thus establishment charges come to 50 per cent of the repairing charges. We thought that when some establishments were required for original works only a portion of them would be necessary for repairs. We may of course have the story that a number of people were permanently appointed originally and they have now no work to do. That only shows the evil of appointing men in anticipation of work but without any work actually. I would therefore like to know whether there is any possibility of reducing this establishment? In the sister department referred to in the next grant also the same thing happens and about that I have given notice of a separate motion. There also repairing charges come to 10 lakhs and establishment charges to $6\frac{1}{2}$ lakhs. There seems to be something wrong somewhere.”

18th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur C. V. S. NARASIMHA RAJU :—“ In this connexion I wish to draw the attention of the hon. the Revenue Member to the reduction under maintenance and repairs mentioned in paragraph 48 of the Finance Secretary’s memorandum. It is stated there that ‘the departmental budget estimate for 1922–23 aggregated 10·34 lakhs but as a result of the retrenchment policy the figure was reduced to 7·59, the chief reductions being 42 under original works, 2·20 under maintenance and repairs.’ I submit, Sir, it is a very regrettable thing that reductions should be made in the matter of maintenance and repairs. From the point of view of the cultivator, I hope the hon. the Revenue Member will try his best to come forward with an additional demand for maintenance and repairs out of the 5 lakhs reduced from his demand under revenue. Again in the next paragraph of the same memorandum it is said : ‘ It is further proposed as a measure of economy to abolish all Tank Restoration Scheme divisions and in consequence the provision for Tank Restoration Scheme works has been restricted to 2·00 as against a demand of 4·80.’ If at all any retrenchment is to be effected, it should be effected not by cutting the charges under maintenance and repairs of irrigation works and by giving up Tank Restoration Schemes. They are the main arteries even from the revenue point of view. They are items not to be touched. We have no right to enhancing such grants. Otherwise, I am sure the hon. the Revenue Member would have been besieged with such motions. If he just refers to the motions of the Council in the past in connexion with budget, he will find many motions to the effect that the minor irrigation works should be the last to be touched and that demand after demand was made to increase the grant under this head.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ Sir, so far as the motion of the hon. Member Mr. Venkataramana Ayyanagar is concerned, it refers to the total allotment of Rs. 2,21,826 appearing at page 62 of the budget estimate. I may at once simplify matters by telling him that this is a total which comprises the salaries of the supervisors whose elimination Mr. Sasi Bhushana Rath has just now suggested and which I have already undertaken to investigate : and if I am satisfied that a considerable reduction can be made under that head, I shall do so.

“ Then, Sir, it would be rather difficult I think to carry out a proportionate reduction all through the arteries of the entire establishment machine, the moment a few thousands of rupees are cut down for expenditure under a few heads. It is not their fault that we have not provided funds sufficiently. On the other hand, the finances of the province did not permit sufficient allotments being placed at the disposal of each district for the purpose of carrying out these works. To throw overboard the permanent establishments in one year and again in another year when there are a few thousands of rupees more to spend to add a few more men, will not only dislocate the work but be inequitable. I quite see that the provision for the next year is unfortunately low. I would have been very glad indeed if it had been multiplied several times. But the finance of the province did not admit of my doing so. As the House will see, these are members of a permanent establishment and it is not at all proposed to add more under any one of these heads. On the other hand amongst temporary men it is proposed to reduce the 18 sub-overseers to 12, because it was found that these temporary men

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [18th March 1922]

will have sufficient work. Wherever possible, reductions have been made but on account of reduction of work in one year, if I remove the permanent men, I am afraid I will be throwing overboard a large number of people ruthlessly.

“As regards the Tank Restoration subdivisions for which my hon. Friend regrets, I think there is no one here who has regretted more over that catastrophe than myself. But, Sir, my hon. Colleague, the Minister, came to the conclusion that there should be a retrenchment of 18 per cent in the establishment of the Public Works Department and I believe his eye fell on the Tank Restoration establishments as well and he has abolished the officers employed on that establishment. I could have done nothing except to have helped him in his attempts to carry on retrenchment, although it was with considerable regret I did so. I agreed to it as the unavoidable alternative”.

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—“May I know, Sir, whether it is open to the hon. the Revenue Member to tell us whether he dissented or agreed to the proposal after placing on record a mild protest?”

The hon. the PRESIDENT:—“I fear the hon. Member Mr. Ranganatha Mudaliyar is making a mountain of a mole hill”.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“In view of these circumstances, it will be apparent that the allotments entered for the next year are under peculiar conditions of the province very low. Complaint was made as regards the high percentage of permanent establishment compared with the actual amount of work done. Here again the Irrigation department barring minor irrigation works has got no establishment of its own for carrying out its general operations. It merely employs the establishment under the control of my hon. Colleague the Minister. So far as account keeping is concerned, the total expenditure incurred on account of public works establishment is adjusted between public works proper—buildings and roads—and irrigation. We have got to bear our own quota of the total expenditure. Whether we carry out works to the extent of 40 lakhs in a year or 35 lakhs, the establishment is there and therefore we are bound to bear a certain amount of expenditure. Otherwise, my hon. Colleague, the Minister, will certainly not agree to inflate his own expenditure and excuse Irrigation department from its legitimate share of the expenditure”.

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU:—“Sir, I believe my hon Friend Mr. Venkataramana Ayyangar has in making the motion only raised the question of policy. I don't think he expected the Revenue Member to make any reduction when he moved this motion. The Revenue Member was good enough to tell us that he would have been glad if a larger allotment was made and he also reminded us of the discussion which took place in the Legislative Assembly. The only point for consideration is whether in a year when works have been cut out, and the Tank Restoration Scheme has been kept in abeyance and where estimates for original works have been given up, it is desirable to have this large establishment”.

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—“May I at once point out, Sir, that this establishment is independent of the Tank Restoration Scheme establishment? This is a permanent annexure to the Collectors' establishments working under tahsildars”.

18th March 1922]

Rao Bahadur A. S. KRISHNA RAO PANTULU :—“I am quite aware of that, Sir. I wish to point out whether in a year when we are not doing useful work in the direction of improving these tanks, when there is a setback to the policy which has been in operation for several years, steps could not have been taken for reducing that establishment much further. I am prepared to state that the Council will be glad to go to a further extent than the hon. Member, if he is in a position to come out with a further increase of expenditure under this department.

“ He told us that quite against his will he could not provide for minor irrigation works being carried out to the extent to which he would desire. There is no justification for the continuance of the whole establishment without there being any proper work to keep them engaged. I would only ask the hon. the Revenue Member whether he could not come again and ask for a supplementary demand for carrying on minor irrigation works in the various parts of the presidency. So far as the Council is concerned, I believe I am voicing the feelings of several members when I say that it will meet all reasonable demands of the Government in matters of national concern. If retrenchment has been suggested in the matter of establishments and salaries, it is because of the feeling in this House and also abroad that there has been a large increase of salaries without a corresponding benefit to the people which would justify the increase in expenditure. If there has been actual benefit to the people by expansion of irrigation works, I have not the slightest doubt that this Council will not grudge to vote for the establishments. But so far as we have seen, there has been a fall in the matter of irrigation works. It is not known how far the declarations made by the Irrigation Commission have been carried out. I do not know what effect has been given to these proposals during the coming year. I trust that the hon. Member will not swerve from the position which has been taken hitherto that all the irrigation works should be finished in the course of a certain number of years. I only repeat my request that if it is necessary for the hon. the Revenue Member to retain the establishment for the coming year, he will justify its existence by providing for extension of irrigation works and by seeing that these works are carried out.”

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—“ I wish to say a few words, Sir. Certainly my idea is not to reduce the expenditure in this department. We not only do not want to curtail the expenditure, but if we had the power, we can go beyond and ask for more expenditure being incurred under this head. It is because we have not got the power to increase the expenditure that we have tabled this motion to elicit information and see whether more money could be spent on irrigation works. As for the establishment, I will be the last man to ask for permanent establishment being disbanded. Already many of the temporary hands who have been working for several years have been disbanded. My only request is that if in the course of the year vacancies occur they may be kept without being filled up. And the sum so spared over the establishments may be utilized for irrigation works. Irrigation works can be extended in two ways, one is by asking for additional grants and the other is by saving money and utilizing the amount saved. With these few words, Sir, I gladly withdraw my motion.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

[18th March 1922]

Motion 325.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

325. *To reduce the total allotment of Rs. 7,59,000 for miscellaneous irrigation expenditure by Rs. 100.*

“ This motion covers the whole of the allotment for miscellaneous irrigation expenditure and is not merely confined to the question of establishments like the previous motion. Perhaps the hon. the Revenue Member is aware that when he was in this Council in a much less responsible position, he was one of those who was very enthusiastic in regard to the affairs of our old irrigation works. I remember having heard him many times ventilating that view. For the past ten years this question has been agitating the country. It was discussed a number of times and one of the members of the Board of Revenue wrote a big volume on this matter. Mr. Buckley was very eloquent and one day he and other members of the Board were talking about the very things we are now suggesting. We are now suggesting that we should have a certain amount of control and we wish that efficiency is maintained, at the same time cutting down the allotment under this head. After all hon. Members will see that an establishment costing two lakhs and odd has to be employed in spending five lakhs in repairs and Rs. 10,000 in new works.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“ I have already stated, Sir, that a certain percentage of the establishment is employed by the Public Works Department.”

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—“ I am not however distributing the blame between the Public Works Department and the Irrigation Department. I want to impress upon him the absolute necessity of putting more money on repairs of tanks under the control of the revenue establishment. What I do contend is that it was open for the hon. the Revenue Member to have pressed for money in regard to this matter. I do not know whether in the existing areas it is open to the Government to spend borrowed money on this class of works. I am not quite sure; the heading is ‘other revenue expenditure financed from ordinary revenues’. I submit that it is absolutely unsatisfactory and it is a sheer waste of money to have this huge establishment on a permanent basis and not to allow money to be spent on the most necessary question of giving better facilities for irrigation. I think, Sir, when we are trying to borrow money for the construction of the Rameswaram canal and for distributing money for the Cochin harbour and for giving a large amount to the Madras Corporation, it is absolutely unsound to leave the village tanks without any repairs. I do not however wish to complicate the tank restoration schemes. But unfortunately I see that in regard to irrigation works for the coming year, even productive works for which my hon. friend might have borrowed money have been made to suffer. I see absolutely no money is provided for improvement in the deltas. I do not know who is responsible for this part of the budget adjustment; but all the same the Government is collectively responsible to this House for seeing that productive works are properly looked after. If only my hon. Friend had been keen about the matter he could have obtained the necessary allotment. But unfortunately that has not been done not only with regard to this class of works, but also I am sorry to say suitable attention has not been paid to the extension of minor irrigation works under the charge of the Revenue Department. There is no expenditure which can be desired for on any works more

18th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pantulu]

than on the improvement of irrigation works. I would therefore request hon. Members who are responsible for the administration of the finances of the presidency to carefully consider this question of improving the irrigation sources. At the top of it all, I see that my hon. Friend who promised to have a special party has taken steps to abolish it from the next year. It may be a measure of economy but it is certainly a measure of false economy. Investigation of irrigation projects pending for the past thirty years have been kept in abeyance for another year, and in the meantime officers who have been getting on with the schemes are retiring, and then they will have to begin again *da capo*. I trust that the hon. the Revenue Member will initiate a new policy and put in as much money as possible for schemes which have been pending for years. I can assure the hon. the Revenue Member that he will have the support of the entire House in securing sanction for any expenditure which he may bring forward for irrigation purposes. I trust that whatever has been said to-day in regard to this matter will receive due consideration at the hands of the Government."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :— "Sir, I fully share the depth of feeling and the very pathetic appeal which my hon. Friend has made in respect of irrigation which is under my control. Nobody, I think, was sadder than myself when I found that it was not possible for me to secure for the next year as much money as I would indeed wish to be spent on this head. But, Sir, the interests of the province and its present financial position and all other circumstances precluded me from asserting myself over and above the other demands which I think from the standpoint of other members of Government responsible therefor have their own importance. Of course the only thing that I could have done as the hon. the Mover suggested was to have gone in for a larger loan for the purpose of carrying out more works in the course of the next year. But, Sir, I may at the same time assure him that if that was considered financially possible, I should have done so. By 'financially possible,' I mean that if there was any scheme, cut-and-dry and completely investigated, waiting only for execution for the purpose of necessary funds being provided, then I might probably have embarked upon that policy. But as I have already told the House on a previous occasion there is no such cut-and-dry scheme ready for execution. There are more schemes in what I may call, half finished, very nearly completed, and nearly investigated, stage. Therefore it was impossible for me to have tried to spend any money from loans on technically productive expenditure. I could not have utilised loan money for unproductive expenditure. That of course I would be prevented from doing. Then, again, the financial possibilities of the province are a great consideration. It was not merely a question of borrowing but the question with which we would have been faced for the next year would be the question of the repayment of the loan both for principal and interest. The repayment of that loan would have been a charge upon the revenues of the province until the particular scheme in respect of which that money was spent was able to yield a sufficient revenue; and no scheme on which any money is sunk to-day can become productive to-morrow, for in the early stages, we will have to wait for a sufficiently long period after the execution of the work. Then, there is the second stage when the revenue that is expected does not come in full, and then at the last stage, it becomes fully remunerative. These experiments could not be undertaken at a time when the revenues of the province were not

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [18th March 1922]

sufficient for meeting even the ordinary expenditure. We have had to resort to additional taxation to keep the pot boiling and to resort to borrowing from the Government of India for the purpose of meeting our ordinary needs from day to day. Under these circumstances it was not even possible to have asked for any large loan with a view to its being expended on productive works which have yet to be fully examined and decided upon.

"I should like to say that this is a time of peculiar financial stringency.

5 p.m. Under the circumstances I was not able to scrape more money. If in the next year it is possible to transfer money from any other head I shall gladly utilize it for irrigation works. Nothing will gladden my heart more than to apply for supplementary grant next year for irrigation schemes from any other possible savings. This is a period of great financial depression, and it has depressed my heart very much indeed when I find it impossible to secure more money for irrigation purposes."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU :—"I have only one word to say. This is not the time to examine the statement of my hon. Friend on its merits. No doubt this is a period of financial stringency. If my hon. Friend is not able to find more money for the irrigation schemes, the best way is not to send away the special officer who is working at new schemes, but to retain his services and to ask him to continue so that when better times come we can take them in hand."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—"At present I have asked the special officer to work till the end of April next. If the schemes prepared by him are to be taken up after examination by our expert, the Chief Engineer for Irrigation, it would involve an expenditure of a few crores of rupees."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motions 326 and 327.

The following motions were not made :—

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

326. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,44,842 for establishment by Rs. 1,00,000.*

Mr. C. V. VENKATARAMANA AYYANGAR :—

327. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 2,21,247 for establishment by Rs. 50,000*

Motion 328.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—"Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

328. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,33,122 for navigation, embankment, etc. works by Rs. 50,000.*

"We have two grievances, Sir : One is that more money is not spent on works. For the next year only Rs. 70,000 are to be spent for works and Rs. 4,00,000 for repairs. But the hon. the Revenue Member said that there was no more money available for the purpose. Our other grievance is that more than sufficient money is spent on establishment. Our grievance is all the greater because the estimate for next year is Rs. 2,21,247, whereas the revised estimate for 1921-22 is only Rs. 1,90,000 for establishment. When more money could not be provided for works it is by no means conceivable how

18th March 1922] [Mr. T. M. Narasimhacharlu]

there could have been an increase of about Rs. 30,000 on establishments. I appeal to the hon. the Revenue Member to examine this question well. Suppose he has no work in his house, will he continue to employ more workmen than are necessary? He will simply tell them: 'I have no work for you. I have to dispense with your services and so goodbye.' That is exactly what should be done in the department. No doubt he has said that the Supervisors may have to go. But there are hosts of other officers whose services can be dispensed with."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:— "Sir, there are two kinds of Irrigation officers. One is the Minor Irrigation staff, and they work under the control of the Revenue Department. I have done what could be done towards retrenchment in the Minor Irrigation Department. The other forms part of the Public Works Department, though they are in charge of Irrigation works. A large portion of the allotment under Establishment is the contribution made to the department concerned towards the pay of the Public Works officers in charge of irrigation works. So all the appeals and requests to bid goodbye to the latter establishment should be addressed to the hon. the Minister for Public Works. But everybody is aware that he has already done his level best in that direction. The hon. Member regrets that more money than last year is proposed to be spent on establishments, though more money could not be spared for Works. The increase in the amount under Establishment is due to the fact that time-scale is in operation in every department. Once you have undertaken the responsibility for time-scale you must be prepared for increased expenditure under salary as years advance. I have to add also that we would have to pay the same percentage contribution to the Public Works Department whether we budget for a small amount of work or whether we have ten times the work. This is the reason why it has not been possible to reduce the allotment under 'Salaries'."

Mr. A. RANGANATHA MUDALIYAR:—"I am sorry for the speech of the hon. the Revenue Member. It is unfortunate that the responsibility is shifted from one shoulder to another. Would it not be better if the various departments co-ordinate and see what could be done in the matter of retrenchment? The remedy seems to consist in either the transfer of the subject of 'Irrigation' to the Minister in charge of 'Public Works' or in the transfer of 'Public Works' to the hon. the Revenue Member who looks after 'Irrigation.' Further, cannot these overseers and others who have not much work to do be employed in other departments? There are local bodies who require their services, and it will be advantageous to the general tax-payer if the services of these officers are utilized for Local Board work. I am not giving this as a well-thought-out suggestion, but I simply throw it out to be considered for what it is worth."

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU:—"I regret the hon. the Revenue Member has not thought fit to accept this proposal for the reduction of the modest sum of Rs. 50,000 out of an allotment of Rs. 6,33,122. It is really a very small sum, and something can certainly be done to reduce the allotment. It is false economy to retain a large establishment while you have no work."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have really nothing more to add to what I have already said. Proposals are made on the basis that these officers of the Irrigation Department have no

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [18th March 1922]

work, and that they can be sent to the help of other departments. These officers have work to do. It may be that they have not much work to do, but they do have work."

The motion was put to the vote and lost.

Motion 329.

The following motion was not made:—

Sriman BISWANATH DAS Mahasayo:—

329. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 33,07,260 under 'XV. Irrigation' by Re. 1.*

Motion 330.

Mr. M. SURYANARAYANA PANTULU:—"I beg to make the following motion:—

330. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 33,07,260 under 'XV. Irrigation' by Rs. 100.*

"We find in page 38 of the memorandum of the Financial Secretary the following:—

'Works for which neither Capital nor Revenue Accounts are kept; Account 7-13, Budget estimate for 1921-22—7-69, Budget estimate for 1922—6-95 lakhs.'

"That is to say we have budgeted 74 lakh less than what has been spent in 1920-21. I submit, whatever retrenchment may be effected in the matter of retrenchment in salaries it is not right that there should be a diminution in the expenditure on actual repairs of minor irrigation works. I therefore submit, Sir, that the policy of the Government in spending less for actual repairs of irrigation works is certainly not correct, and something must be done to remedy this."

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:—"I have nothing more to add to what I have already said. The reason why particular items were surrendered is because we considered that postponement of expenditure on one or two items included originally would not in any way be serious in a period of financial stringency. That is the reason why we surrendered that outlay. Otherwise we would not have surrendered the amount."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

Motion 331.

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"Sir, 5-15 p.m. I beg to make the following motion:—

331. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 39,000 for construction of irrigation, etc. works by Rs. 100.*

"Sir, I wish to call attention to the necessity for more expenditure in this connexion. This question was raised last year by Mr. Padsha Sahib, and it was then brought to the notice of the hon. the Revenue Member that the necessary steps with a view to protect famine-affected areas should be undertaken by the Government. In that connexion I also brought to the notice of the hon. the Revenue Member the recommendations of the Irrigation Committee, viz., that the best way of relief for all time to come is not by spending

18th March 1922] [Mr. M. Ramachandra Rao Pastulu]

money when famine occurs but to take steps against its recurrence by the construction of suitable irrigation works. Nothing has been done, and the allotment under this head has been cut down from Rs. 64,000 in 1920-21 to Rs. 39,000 for 1922-23. The budget estimate for 1921-22 was Rs. 58,000 and the revised estimate for the same year was Rs. 48,000. There are two other items, Sir, in this connexion which I should like to mention. This sum seems to provide for construction of irrigation, navigation, embankment and drainage works. I ask my hon. friend whether there are not proposals for the construction of drainage works, whether any attempt has been made to answer the demand of the Public Works officers for more money, for drainage works. The question of Gôdâvari and Kistna drainage has been one which has been continuously brought to the notice of the Government, and we cannot see anything either in the budget or in the explanatory note as to what action has been taken during the year. When the hon. Member goes round to Gôdâvari and Kistna he is being flooded with deputations and with petitions of various kinds. He has seen hundreds of ryots representing to him the subject of drainage. I should like to ask what has been done in this matter. Where is the evidence that any attempt has been made to satisfy the people at least to the extent to which it is possible to do so in regard to this question of drainage? I think if there is one thing which is causing considerable dissatisfaction for the last 20 years it is this drainage. It has been brought to the notice of the hon. the Revenue Member continuously and yet nothing has actually been done. On the contrary the matter seems to be going backwards. I would not be satisfied merely with pious hopes that something would be done if money were available. I should like to know what it is the Government are going to do to rectify these defects.

“There are a good many other things about the deltaic systems. I should like to know the policy of the Government in regard to these and what attempts have been made to redress the grievances of the ryots. Thousands of acres are flooded year after year and the country is losing valuable crops. Is there one matter in which the Government has got a forward policy? If there is a forward policy, there would have been schemes all over the Presidency on which expenditure of several crores would be required.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur:— “I may at once point out that the provision that has been made in the next year's budget is in respect of certain works which we found were necessary even in a year of financial stringency. I had given an undertaking to the House sometime ago when, I think, my hon. Colleague for Public Works was in the other bench and had pressed the claims of the Ganjam district in the matter of irrigation. I had then given him an assurance that the Ganjam district deserved every consideration in the matter of the development of irrigation facilities, and that our first pet child in the matter of any possible expenditure for the development of irrigation would be Ganjam. Because, not only Ganjam had to pass through a number of famines during recent years, but we also knew that even in ordinary years, except depending upon what one calls the heaven, there is no other chance for these people to secure water for the purpose of irrigating their lands. The Rushikulya project was one that was prominently brought to the notice of the Council at that time. I agreed to keep the claims of Rushikulya in my mind. I am glad to tell you, Sir, that so far as the slender means at our disposal permitted, I have given the Rushikulya system a place of honour in our programme. There were a few other schemes which were

[Mr. Muhammad Habib-ul-lah Sahib] [18th March 1922]

under the consideration of Government and for which funds had been provided from time to time and which we thought we should not neglect. The other scheme that is included therein is the Nagavalli river system. We have got also the Cuddapah-Kurnool Canal improvements included therein. We have included the restoration of the Kanyampalaiyam anicut in the Coimbatore district. These are the four schemes which we found possible to provide funds for. There were a number of other schemes also. The amount that was asked by the department was Rs. 96,800. On the scrutiny of the estimates we found that the amount that could be regarded as obligatory was Rs. 33,830. There were of course a few other items too which we found were not ready for execution. In the Nellore district we have the Hajipuram tank, the Punalur tank, the Anasamudram tank, and in the Chingleput district the Madras water-supply and irrigation system. That of course is a huge scheme to which we did not commit ourselves, and we do not wish to incur any initial expenditure on any scheme which would involve us in a large commitment. So, as I said, the selection of works for any given year largely depends on the availability of funds, and so far as the money that was placed at the disposal of this particular head was concerned, I had to exercise my judgment and discretion in distributing that amount. That I have not been able to secure more is indeed to be regretted. That I have not been able to do so is neither my own fault nor the fault of the hon. the Finance Member. On the other hand, the fault has already been laid by the Finance Member at other doors. That of course accounts for the whole thing. If more money is available I assure the hon. Member that I can utilize it for some of the important schemes which deserve our attention. My only difficulty is that I could not scrape a pie more than what I have been able to secure for the irrigation department, and if the hon. Members can make it possible for me to secure more money, I can assure the House that I shall be very glad to do what I can in that direction."

Diwan Bahadur M. RAMACHANDRA RAO PANTULU:—"I should like to make one observation. The finances of any year are either by way of current revenues or by way of loan funds. I should like to put before the hon. the Finance Member this fact, viz., the power of Government to borrow for productive works is absolutely unlimited—I do not say unlimited by the conditions of the market, but unlimited by rules. The Devolution rules are sufficiently elastic to place in the hands of the Finance Member and the Revenue Member any amount of money provided they put forward productive schemes. It was complained that whenever the Madras province had a scheme they had to go to the Government of India for money, and their resources are limited to 12½ lakhs. That restriction has been removed. I ask the hon. the Finance Member whether this year any loan money has been earmarked for schemes of irrigation works, that are pending. I will merely suggest this, that they should have this matter continuously pushed forward, and independently of taxation proposals or current revenues of the Presidency, they have in their hands an instrument for good, and that is, to borrow as much money as possible as required by the circumstances of the case for major productive works. Why don't they do it? That is my point. This year I have not seen any evidence or anxiety to put more money into productive works. Having said that I do not wish to say anything more, unless the hon. the Finance Member wants to say anything."

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

18th March 1922]

Motion 332.

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“Sir, I beg to make the following motion :—

332. *To reduce the allotment of Rs. 93,400 for hydro-electric surveys by Rs. 50,000.*

“Sir, I shall shorten my speech by a mere request for information as to why this year there should be more provision made under this head than in the last year.”

The hon. Khan Bahadur MUHAMMAD HABIB-UL-LAH SAHIB Bahadur :—“I think this is a matter in which I am glad my hon. Colleague the Minister for Industries is greatly interested. This provision was inserted in compliance with a very strong note which he has put on record, advocating the expenditure of this money which he regards as most essential for the development of the industrial life of this country. If the hon. Mover thinks that it is a waste of money, I have no objection to withdraw it.”

The hon. Rai Bahadur K. VENKATA REDDI NAYUDU :—“This industrial survey was originally conducted by the Government of India. Some electrical surveys were made, some charts were prepared and the sources where electricity was forthcoming were ascertained. Later on, when the Department of Industries was transferred, firstly to the provinces, and then to the Ministers, the Indian Government practically washed their hands of it, with the result that we have been busy with experiments regarding power which electricity alone could supply. If that is developed, we can utilize it for the various industries in the country. I would therefore earnestly appeal to the hon. Member to realize that this is intended for developing electricity and, through that, our industries.”

Rai Bahadur T. M. NARASIMHACHARLU :—“I do not wish to press it as the hon. the Minister for Development says that it is required to develop our province.”

The motion was by leave withdrawn.

The question that the Government be granted a sum not exceeding Rupees 60.72 lakhs under Demand VI—Irrigation was put and carried.

The grant was made.

The Council adjourned at 5-30 p.m. to meet at 11 a.m. on Monday the 20th March 1922.

L. D. SWAMIKANNU,
Secretary to the Legislative Council.

